



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE
& PETERBOROUGH**
COMBINED AUTHORITY

CAMBRIDGESHIRE & PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY: MINUTES

Date: Wednesday, 28th March 2018

Time: 10.30a.m. – 1.00p.m.

Present: J Palmer (Mayor)

G Bull – Huntingdonshire District Council, S Count - Cambridgeshire County Council, L Herbert – Cambridge City Council, J Holdich – Peterborough City Council, D Mason (substituting for C Seaton – Fenland District Council), C Roberts – East Cambridgeshire District Council, and P Topping – South Cambridgeshire District Council

Observers: J Ablewhite (Police and Crime Commissioner)), G Howsam (substituting for J Bawden (Clinical Commissioning Group)), and Councillor J Peach (substituting for Councillor K Reynolds (Chairman, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority))

157. APOLOGIES AND DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Apologies received from Councillor C Seaton, and J Bawden and Councillor K Reynolds.

Councillor Roberts declared a non-statutory disclosable interest under the Code of Conduct in relation to Minute No.168, as a Director of the East Cambridgeshire Trading Company. He did not take part in the debate or vote.

The Chief Executive also declared a non-statutory disclosable interest under the Code of Conduct in relation to Minute No.169, as a Director of the Greater Cambridgeshire Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership (GCGP LEP).

158. MINUTES – 28TH FEBRUARY 2018

The minutes of the meeting held on 28th February 2018 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

159. PETITIONS

No petitions were received.

160. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions were received.

161. FORWARD PLAN

The Board noted the Forward Plan of Executive Decisions dated to be published on 26 March 2018. The Mayor confirmed that there would be no meeting in April.

It was resolved unanimously to approve the Forward Plan of Executive Decisions dated to be published on 26 March 2018.

The Mayor made the following announcements before proceeding with the agenda:

- the Combined Authority had made it through to the next round of funding with Government for the Cambridge North East Fringe housing development.
- the Combined Authority had received the first tranche of £1.3M funding for the Local Energy Hub project which was being co-ordinated by the new Business Board.
- the Government had agreed funding of £40M to the new Business Board.

162. CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH STRATEGIC SPATIAL FRAMEWORK (NON STATUTORY)

The Portfolio Holder for Strategic Planning reported that the Districts Councils had effective local plans totalling 100,000 new homes and 90,000 new jobs by 2036. As part of Phase 1, the non-statutory Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Strategic Spatial Framework would bring all these plans together in one place. The next phase would scope the opportunities for longer-term strategic planning until 2050. The Framework supported the Combined Authority's ambition for sustainable growth, and would be used to attract resources from Government. Attention was drawn to the following reflected in the Framework: the importance of connectivity; the need to ensure growth was spread across the geography of Cambridgeshire; the importance of tackling areas of deprivation and inequality; and the importance of a Quality Charter to ensure high quality development. In conclusion, the Portfolio Holder thanked all local authorities and other partners for their input.

One Member was reassured that the Framework would not affect local plans, and that consultation would go beyond the local plan timeframe. However, he queried the lack of reference to social and cultural infrastructure. He was aware that the Arts Council had attempted to talk to the Authority on two occasions, and urged that a meeting take place as soon as possible. The Portfolio Holder acknowledged the importance of existing local plans. He also stressed the importance of community inclusion which had been patchy in several new developments. It was therefore important to identify cultural and environmental assets which could contribute to planning growth including investing in arts and culture.

Another Member welcomed the unifying vision provided by the Framework for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. He drew attention to the section on utilities and, in particular, digital connectivity and communications. He stressed that this was integral to the success of any new community. He therefore hoped that partners could continue to work together to deliver them particularly across borders.

The Board was informed that South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) had a joint local plan with Cambridge City Council, which reflected increased joint working amongst District Councils. Attention was drawn to the fact that not all the Local Plans had been adopted, which was contrary to what was indicated in the Framework. SCDC was still waiting for the Government Inspector to give her opinion. The Portfolio Holder acknowledged the need for minor amendments, and expressed his frustration at the time taken to approve the Local Plan.

The Mayor commented on the importance of members of the Board meeting regularly and working together for the mutual benefit of growth in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) approve this first phase of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Strategic Spatial Framework (Non Statutory).
- b) note the intention of the Portfolio Holder for Strategic Planning to bring a report to the Board in June scoping proposals for the status, approach and resources needed to deliver the next phase of the Framework to 2050.

The Mayor agreed to

- c) exercise his general power of competence to publish the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Strategic Spatial Framework following a vote of unanimous consent subject to including the minor amendments raised at the meeting.

163. TRANSPORT DELIVERY 2018/19

The Transport and Infrastructure Director presented a report identifying the key transport interventions which were being promoted. It also provided an overview of the transport interventions currently being funded by the Combined Authority. It was noted that the pipeline of schemes proposed in the report built on the Priority Transport Schemes approved by the Board in October 2017. Attention was drawn to the benefits of such a pipeline, which could contribute to the Authority's objectives. Members were reminded of the methodology for prioritising investment which included a full scoring matrix at Appendix B. Members noted the strategic transport projects which had potential to deliver significant benefits to the area. They also noted a table setting out the pipeline of schemes which had secured funding in October and those where funding was being requested, which included the lead authority and the delivery partner. Attention was drawn to LEP transport priorities, other local authority transport, and strategic transport bodies. The funding table and key funding sources were set out in the report.

One Member raised the need for funding to be identified to reflect Mass Rapid Transit for Peterborough. Another Member stressed the need to bring out explicitly the economic mission in relation to supporting the objectives set out in the Authority's vision. He highlighted the importance of an economic analysis, as the transport infrastructure was needed to enable economic prosperity. The Chief Executive acknowledged the relevance of these points. The Economic Commission was currently leading on the development of a Local Industrial Strategy, which would dovetail with the future Local Transport Plan and transport initiatives.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) agree a total budget allocation of £18.305m, comprising £16.13m in 2018/19 and £2.18m in 2019/20 for the rolling programme of priority transport and infrastructure schemes.
- b) note the £6.65m funding secured from the National Productivity Investment Funding for 2018/19 which was included within the total budget allocation.
- c) agree the pipeline of projects set out in the multi-year transport programme.
- d) authorise the Chief Executive to delegate responsibility and budget for the production of feasibility studies, business case or designs for each of the projects within the multi-year transport programme to a delivery partner, provided that all such studies, business cases and designs are to be reported back to the Combined Authority Board for approval.

164. DIGITAL CONNECTIVITY INFRASTRUCTURE: IMPROVING MOBILE COVERAGE AND INCREASING THE FULL FIBRE FOOTPRINT ACROSS CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH

The Programme Director Connecting Cambridgeshire introduced a report detailing the importance of fast, reliable internet connections for economic growth. She reminded the Board that the Connecting Cambridgeshire Programme had been running for several years. She explained that Superfast Broadband included full fibre and mobile connectivity. It was noted that mobile connectivity in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough was worse than the England average. She highlighted proposals for public access Wi-Fi particularly in the market towns. It was noted that it would be achieved by maximising private sector investment and using public funding. The proposed programme would run from April 2018 through to March 2022.

In welcoming the report, the Peterborough City Council representative highlighted the £30m from the City Council to provide connectivity to businesses, schools, CCTV, Traffic Control, and to connect fibre to most houses. The Cambridgeshire County Council representative commented that he was proud of the achievements of the Connecting Cambridgeshire Programme, which had exceeded its 95% target for superfast broadband coverage in the County. The programme now had a very ambitious target to reach over 99% coverage by the end of 2020. This was a real marker to business that Cambridgeshire and Peterborough could deliver in terms of connectivity.

Members were informed that the legislation relating to mobile coverage was not the same as broadband. With the establishment of the Combined Authority there was an opportunity to improve mobile coverage above the national average, which was set out in the report. The Police and Crime Commissioner reported that the emergency services were investing in mobile technology but struggled to get a secure network on Wi-Fi in the home or office. One Member commented that connectivity infrastructure was not just about the economy, it could also be used to address rural isolation. The CCG representative reported that it would enable health care to be delivered differently via a TeleMed solution, and was important for reactive and preventative health care.

The Mayor commented that digital connectivity was an integral part of daily life, and it was not acceptable to have some areas where you could not make or receive a phone call.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) note the digital infrastructure and mobile coverage in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and endorse the vision for the Mayoral Combined Authority to be a leading area for digital connectivity.
- b) approve in principle a budget of up to £5.66m to support the extension of the Connecting Cambridgeshire programme.
- c) authorise the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Mayor, to approve the business case and draw-down of funds in accordance with the approved business case relating to improvements to mobile coverage and the full fibre footprint for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.
- d) delegate to the Director of Strategy and Planning authority to approve the programme reporting and delivery arrangements in partnership with Cambridgeshire County Council and the other Combined Authority Constituent Councils.

165. UNIVERSITY OF PETERBOROUGH – INTERIM ACCOMMODATION OPTIONS

Before the Portfolio Holder Skills introduced the report, the Portfolio Holder for Fiscal Strategy proposed an amendment requesting that the following wording be added to the recommendation: *“subject to the Combined Authority seeking security over the future assets of the University of Peterborough with a view to recycling funding”*. Whilst he fully supported a University of Peterborough, it was important that the Authority secured its assets in the event of changing circumstances, and recycled the funding accordingly. Other Members acknowledged that the Portfolio Holder for Fiscal Strategy was right to seek security of funding. The Portfolio Holder for Skills accepted the amendment and agreed that it should be included as part of the whole recommendation to the Board.

The Portfolio Holder for Skills reminded the Board that £6.3m had originally been agreed for interim accommodation. He proposed removing the word “interim” in order to provide a permanent site, which could easily be extended. He therefore recommended Option 3 which would be delivered at a cost of £9.74m minus £2.7m. He reported that the City Council had plans to deal with housing. He raised concern about an inaccurate article in the Peterborough Telegraph which implied that the site would be providing accommodation for 3,000 students. It was important to note that the site would be a place for learning not for providing sleeping accommodation for students.

Other Members welcomed the proposal and thanked partners for helping to reach this point. One Member highlighted the need for a cycle bridge over the river. The Portfolio Holder for Skills reported that a bridge was integral for the development around the University but not the University itself. A proper cycle bridge and disabled access would need to be provided but not funded by the Combined Authority.

The Portfolio Holder for Fiscal Strategy drew attention to the fact that the most expensive option was being recommended. He commented that it was not expensive if it achieved best value. A City Centre site would be a great facility attracting students to Peterborough. He was not in favour of a split site and commented that there was only a marginal difference in unit costs. In his view, it was a justifiable investment in future students to improve economic growth in Peterborough.

One Member queried the ability of the University to compete in the market place. In response, the Mayor acknowledged that the University needed to set itself apart from

other universities to be something exceptional. It was important that the University did not chase every student pound but instead provided graduates who could then feed into the local economy. He stressed the need for courses to reflect and strengthen the economic area taking advantage of the area's history in relation to engineering. Given the problem with teacher retention, it should also provide teacher training. Other areas would include science courses in order to encourage the spread of scientific jobs to the north of the county and create a larger Silicon Fen, and Agri-tech. The Portfolio Holder for Skills had been informed that one or two companies would re-locate to Peterborough if they could link in to the University, which would bring research and more highly skilled jobs to Peterborough and Fenland.

The Mayor congratulated the City Council and partners. He reported that the Combined Authority was committed to investing in the City to provide a high quality university. However, he acknowledged the need for the Authority to also protect its finances. He expected that the Combined Authority investment would also attract private sector investment in Peterborough.

It was resolved unanimously to approve:

Option 3 (recommended option): Allocate a budget of £9.74m to base all facilities on the Embankment development site, subject to the Combined Authority seeking security over the future assets of the University of Peterborough with a view to recycling funding. This is a single site solution.

166. £70M CAMBRIDGE CITY DEVOLUTION HOUSING PROGRAMME

Before inviting the Interim Lead on Housing to introduce the report, the Mayor proposed an amendment to recommendation (a) to add the following: *“and approve funding for the year 1 schemes of £971,216”*. The purpose of the amendment was to ask for payment of the funding for delivering the housing schemes referred to in the report. The amendment was supported by all members of the Board.

Members were reminded of the arrangement with Cambridge City Council to deliver up to 500 Council houses with the £70m secured from Government. The City Council also intended to rely upon additional freedoms to use other housing resources, including receipts from Right to Buy sales, to provide additional funding for the programme. Attention was drawn to Appendix A showing that two units had been completed and a further fourteen were expected start on site by the end of March. 130 units would be built between April to December 2018. There were 467 sites in programme at design, planning and delivery stages so the Combined Authority was well on its way to meeting the target total of 500 delivery (start on site). Arrangements for working with the City Council were set out in Appendix B.

One Member welcomed the report, which clarified the financial arrangement with the Combined Authority. It was noted that the Combined Authority was the accountable body. The Board was informed that the City Council's Planning Committee was considering development on the old Mill Road Depot site. There was also £50m plus of City Council and market funding.

The Portfolio Holder for Fiscal Strategy requested clarification regarding payments to made quarterly in arrears against invoices. The Interim Lead on Housing agreed to investigate as to whether this related to works done on purchases delivered rather than proforma invoices. **Action Required.**

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) note the progress in year 1 of the programme and approve funding for the year 1 schemes of £971,216.
- b) note the forward pipeline.
- c) agree to receive further quarterly progress reports.
- d) note the arrangements for a Strategic Partnership Agreement with Cambridge City Council as the Combined Authority's delivery partner for the £70m programme.

167. £100M AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAMME

The Mayor drew attention to the four confidential appendices, and informed the Board that he would need to exclude the press and public if it wished to discuss them.

The Interim Lead on Housing explained that the report set out progress in achieving the first phase of approvals in the £100m secured to deliver 2,000 affordable homes across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough by the end of March 2022. Attention was drawn to the added value created by the Business Case, which included creating a revolving fund to outlast the five year programme. Members were advised of Phase 1 Quick Wins, which showed that 73% of the approved new homes across eight schemes would start on site by 31 March 2018. Members noted a table detailing current completion forecasts by local authority area by Quarter 4 2019/20. Attention was drawn to the forward programme and pipeline development. The current status of the pipeline was detailed in the table at Section 5.11., which showed that the Authority was on track to meet its affordable homes target. Members were also advised of four schemes which needed Combined Authority grant funding, which had the support of each respective Local Authority Housing Enabling Manager.

In discussing the report, individual members of the Board raised the following issues:

- welcomed the progress made but queried what had happened to the Housing Task Force Group, which enabled each constituent Council to engage in this work. Another Member reported that he was unaware that this Group had not met, and added that it was important to re-engage every membership council in order to get projects moving. The Interim Lead on Housing reassured the Board that all schemes had been co-developed with the Local Authority Housing Enabling Managers. Although there was no Task Group, there was a sub-regional housing group which met monthly with officers.
- expressed concern that vulnerability had not been reflected in the report. The commitment to support vulnerable residents with complex needs should be a 'golden thread' through the housing programme, and included in future reports. In response, the Mayor confirmed that this would be the case in future. **Action Required.**
- highlighted the need for the new building money to be recycled.
- highlighted the need to review the terms of the grant for £3.66m for the next Phase 2 of affordable housing schemes. The Portfolio Holder Fiscal Strategy reported that he did not like the re-labelling grants. He stressed the importance of the Authority reaching its target within the time constraints. He raised the need for a clawback mechanism if delivery partners failed to meet their targets. He was aware that the viability of schemes had been assessed and that the Authority might need to fund

gaps. However, the market conditions could change as a result of a delay leading to a significant funding gap, which should be funded by the organisation delivering the scheme. Other Members acknowledged the need for due diligence. It was important that there should be a clawback mechanism if people failed to deliver. It was noted that this could also accelerate delivery. One Member reported that the criteria included the viability of schemes. The Portfolio Holder Fiscal Strategy acknowledged that testing had been carried out based on predictions but it was important that this was measured afterwards.

- questioned whether all the appendices should have been excluded.
- expressed concern about the progress being made. One Member raised the need to strengthen the trajectory which was currently not strong enough. He reported that 253 units had originally been predicted in 2017/18 as Phase 1 Quick Wins but this was now down to 185 units. It was important to take the opportunity to identify extra projects to avoid paying back some of the funding to Government. South Cambridgeshire, Huntingdonshire and Peterborough had the biggest affordability problem. He was concerned that the numbers for Northstowe were not on track. He therefore requested that a 'watch-list' be established for any projects not delivered at the halfway point of September 2019. It was also important to have a Plan B if the Authority was not on schedule by this date.
- noted that the infrastructure work at Mare Fen, Northstowe would help deliver 540 units. The Portfolio Holder for New Homes and Communities reminded the Board that the Business Case had agreed that South Cambridgeshire had the highest need. It was important to discuss in public any proposal to revisit this strategy or move away from the position agreed with DCLG. The Portfolio Holder Fiscal Strategy reported that he was concerned about the delivery timeframe. He suggested that it was more important to bring forward as many schemes as possible rather than to concentrate too much on where they should be located. Although, the Authority needed to focus on the areas of high need, it also needed to keep in mind the end date.
- acknowledged that if the Authority did not have large sites like Northstowe, it would not reach its target. Although smaller sites were important, it was the big sites which would deliver. The Portfolio Holder for New Homes and Communities stressed that it was critical the Authority had a 'watch-list' containing a realistic assessment of sites. The Authority needed to be consistent in providing a clear message to people working with it in relation to its intention and purpose.
- acknowledged that it was sensible to only pay out funding once schemes had started. Housing Associations would be able to draw down funding as they delivered. If they could not deliver within the timescale, the grant would be pulled and given to the next tranches of houses.

The Portfolio Holder Fiscal Strategy proposed an amendment, seconded by the Deputy Mayor, to add the following to recommendation c) *subject to the terms of the grant agreement being agreed between the Section 151 officer and the Portfolio Holder for Fiscal Strategy*, and an additional recommendation e) *agree that the grant conditions be reviewed generally by the Legal Counsel and Section 151 officer, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Fiscal Strategy*. On being put to the vote, the amendment was carried.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) note the progress of the Phase 1 housing scheme approvals agreed by the Board in July 2017.
- b) note the forward pipeline of affordable housing schemes, including emerging strategic sites.
- c) commit grant funding of £3.66m for the next Phase 2 of affordable housing schemes subject to the terms of the grant agreement being agreed between the Section 151 officer and the Portfolio Holder for Fiscal Strategy.
- d) agree to receive further progress reports on a quarterly basis.
- e) agree that the grant conditions be reviewed generally by the Legal Counsel and Section 151 officer, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Fiscal Strategy.

168. EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE STRATEGIC COMMUNITY LAND TRUST (CLT) PROGRAMME – PROVISION OF LOAN FACILITY

The Mayor drew attention to the two confidential appendices, and informed the Board that he would need to exclude the press and public if it wished to discuss them. The Deputy Mayor reminded the Board that he had a non-statutory disclosable interest under the Code of Conduct, as a Director of the East Cambridgeshire Trading Company (ECTC). He had taken legal advice which had confirmed that he could introduce the report but not debate or vote on the issue. The Chief Executive of East Cambridgeshire District Council (ECDC) was therefore present to answer questions on the report that the Deputy Mayor was prevented from answering.

The Deputy Mayor reported that he was pleased to bring a report detailing an exciting much needed affordable way of providing homes owned by the community, which required no grant or public subsidy. Members were reminded of the background to Community Land Trusts (CLTs) and the work of the ECTC. The Board was being asked to approve a £6.5m commercial loan facility from the £100m Housing Programme to ECTC for a CLT scheme for 54 homes in Haddenham. Although, this scheme was ready to build, it could not commence until sales income had been received from the sales of homes at Ely and Soham. The Authority would therefore be able to speed up the delivery of new homes with the provision of a commercial loan facility to ECTC.

The Board was also being asked to authorise the Chief Executive to bring forward detailed proposals and the business case to the next Board meeting for the provision of a ten year commercial loan facility capped at £40m to fund the East Cambridgeshire CLT Programme of up to a level of 250 homes per annum for 10 years. It was noted that ECDC was also working with SCDC on its first CLT in Cottenham.

The Portfolio Holder for Fiscal Strategy proposed an amendment, seconded by the Portfolio Holder for Skills, to recommendation a) to add the following: *terms including security over the loan or assets, step in rights and/or parent guarantee from East Cambs District Council and in consultation with the Mayor and the Portfolio Holder for Fiscal Strategy.* He reported that he did not want to delay the scheme but it was important the Authority had some security over the loan. Other Members acknowledged the need for due diligence. On being put to the vote, the amendment was carried.

In discussing the report, individual members of the Board raised the following issues:

- queried whether the Authority had the power to loan, and whether ECTC had applied to anyone else for a loan and been rejected. Legal Counsel drew attention to Section 5.1, which confirmed that the Authority had the ability to lend. The Chief Executive of ECDC reported that the District Council had provided the ECTC with a £5m loan when first established. There had been no further applications for loans.
- highlighted the need to separate the giving of a loan for affordable housing and the need to pay the money back. Therefore it was important there was due diligence around the business case in order to achieve both aims. Members were reminded that the £40m loan would be the subject of a report to the next meeting.
- welcomed the amendment. However, expressed concern that the Authority had only recently been informed of this proposal. One Member reported that the Business Case should be approved by the Board first. He suggested that it was not cost free as the money could be used in different ways. He queried why the District Council could not fund the ECTC. The Chief Executive of ECDC reminded the Board that the Council was a small rural district council and had already provided £5m. It would like to provide further loan facilities but was unable to do so given its size. As such, it needed to look to other funding sources to accelerate the programme. He reported that if funding was not forthcoming, the Haddenham project would need to be funded from the sale of homes at Ely and Soham, which was likely to delay it due to seasonal issues.
- expressed concern, whilst understanding the issues relating to seasonality, that there was no business case to demonstrate how it would fit in to the Authority's overall strategy. The Portfolio Holder for New Homes and Communities reported that the proposals for Northstowe had not yet been worked up so funding was not being sought. He was therefore looking for a level of consistency.
- expressed support for CLTs and acknowledged that whilst 19 affordable homes was useful, it was small compared to the Authority's target. The Board's job was to review business cases to make sure the funding was not disproportionately allocated to small schemes. It was therefore suggested that this proposal should be taken to the May meeting to be considered as part of a total package. It would then be clear whether a more general loan was needed given the small number of affordable houses. The same Member added that it was important to consider all options. The Chief Executive of ECDC reminded the Board that the programme used 'a land value capture' mechanism to provide the cross subsidy necessary to build CLT owned affordable homes and other community benefits/assets within the scheme. A mixed market was therefore part of the CLT programme. He reported that the District Council had started to provide the necessary information to inform the business case, which would meet the strategic aims of the Combined Authority. He acknowledged the need for further discussions with the Mayor and the Portfolio Holder Fiscal Strategy, and confirmed that the District Council would provide support and assurance. The Portfolio Holder Fiscal Strategy reported that he was not sure whether a business case would have made much difference as this project was not assessed the same way as other projects. The proposed delegation would ensure that structures were tested. He reported that the Haddenham Scheme would not stop other housing schemes coming forward.

The Mayor highlighted the need to do things differently in a way central Government had failed to do. It was important to be innovative and exciting in order to push the agenda to create a better society for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. He

acknowledged that CLTs were not the answer to every issue but they were a significant way forward. CLTs enabled housing to be delivered within 18 months from first engagement to planning permission thereby accelerating growth. This could only be achieved by engaging with the community. He urged Board Members to use this opportunity to develop similar schemes in their areas.

It was resolved to:

- a) approve the provision of a commercial loan facility capped at £6.5m from the £100m Housing Programme for a period of two years to East Cambs Trading Company Ltd for the CLT scheme at West End Gardens, Haddenham. Approval was subject to completion of the business case, due diligence and agreement of loan terms including security over the loan or assets, step in rights and/parent guarantee from East Cambs District Council to the satisfaction of the Chief Executive, Monitoring Officer and Section 151 Officer in consultation with the Mayor and the Portfolio Holder for Fiscal Strategy.
- b) authorise the Chief Executive to bring forward detailed proposals and the business case to the next Board meeting for the provision of a ten year £40m commercial loan facility capped at £40m to fund the East Cambs Strategic CLT Programme.

169. THE BUSINESS BOARD AND BUSINESS TRANSFER AGREEMENT (FROM THE GREATER CAMBRIDGE GREATER PETERBOROUGH LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP)

The Deputy Mayor commented on the technical nature of this report, and asked the Chief Executive to explain the detail. Attention was drawn to the following four points covered by the report: the vision for the new Business Board; financial position on business transfer; accountable body transitional arrangements; and the new Business Board. Members noted a table detailing the Business Board's relationship with the Combined Authority Board. Members were also advised of the existing capital funding for the LEP programmes of work. It was noted that £28,648,032 would be transferred from the County Council to the Combined Authority on 1 April 2018.

Members were reminded that the Mayor had already committed £400,000 in cash to ensure a successful winding up of the GCGP LEP company. In return, £42m in capital funding would be available to support the economy and business growth. The Board was advised of indemnity cover arrangements for the former Directors of the GCGP LEP, the Chief Executive and Claire Higgins. Attention was drawn to the Business Transfer Agreement attached as Appendix A, which included TUPE arrangements, and business and supplier contracts. In conclusion, the Chief Executive thanked staff and the County Council for their support regarding the transfer.

One Member queried whether the £50m debt to the Department for Transport for the A14 had been taken into account. The Chief Executive reported that it had been identified along with the Cambridge Compass Enterprise Zone.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) agree the vision of how the new Business Board would operate.
- b) agree in principle the Business Transfer Agreement between the Greater Cambridgeshire Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority.

- c) ratify the commitment of £400,000 in cash to the GCGP LEP which was made by the Mayor on the 20 March 2018 in order to ensure a successful winding up of the GCGP LEP company.
- d) agree the longer-term indemnity around the GCGP LEP liabilities as set out in the attached side letter.
- e) agree that Legal Counsel and the Section 151 Officer could make any required changes and sign-off on the final fund amount (Schedule 1) in the Accountable Body Transitional Agreement.
- f) agree that any final insubstantial amendments that were required prior to signing the Business Transfer Agreement, Deed of Indemnity and Authorised Body Transitional Agreement could be made by the Legal Counsel, in consultation with the Mayor as portfolio holder for governance.
- g) agree that the Legal Counsel be authorised to sign the Business Transfer Agreement, Deed of Indemnity and Authorised Body Transitional Agreement for and on behalf of the Combined Authority.

170. MARKET TOWN MASTERPLANS FOR GROWTH

The Deputy Mayor reminded the Board of the pilot approach undertaken in St Neots, the lessons learnt and the move to the delivery phase.

One Member drew attention to the critical spread of Market Towns as detailed on page 248. He commented that the spread of growth in the County rested heavily on the Market Towns. Other Members welcomed the process which had resulted in a good galvanising effect for St Neots but urged officers to use information already available. It was important to engage the public in future rather than rely on a Steering Group so that views of the total community were known. It was also important to consider how Market Towns fed into development elsewhere. One Member highlighted the need to circulate the lessons learnt from the pilot in a report to the Board. **Action Required.**

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) note the proposed principles and role of Market Town Masterplans for Growth as set out in this report
- b) approve the sum of £50,000 to develop a Masterplan for each of the nine market towns (total budget of £450,000)
- c) note that each Masterplan was to be reported to a subsequent Combined Authority Board for approval
- d) note the collaborative arrangements of a Partnership Team with the relevant District Council to develop and subsequently lead the Masterplans

171. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was resolved to note the date of the next meeting – Wednesday, 30 May 2018
Fenland District Council, Fenland Hall, County Road, March PE15 8NQ

The Mayor reported that three members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee were standing down at elections in May. He therefore thanked Councillors Riley, Carter and Hayward for their contribution to the Combined Authority in its first year.

Mayor