



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE
& PETERBOROUGH**
COMBINED AUTHORITY

JAMES PALMER
CAMBRIDGESHIRE &
PETERBOROUGH MAYOR

Agenda Item No: 1.2

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board: Minutes

Date: Wednesday

Time: 10.30am – 2.30pm (adjourned 1.10pm -1.23pm)

Present: Mayor J Palmer

A Adams - Chair of the Business Board, Councillor A Bailey – East Cambridgeshire District Council, Councillor C Boden – Fenland District Council, Councillor R Fuller – Huntingdonshire District Council, Councillor S Count – Cambridgeshire County Council, Councillor L Herbert – Cambridge City Council (to 1.45pm), Councillor J Holdich – Peterborough City Council and Councillor B Smith – South Cambridgeshire District Council

Co-opted Members: Councillor R Bisby, Acting Police and Crime Commissioner and Councillor Davis Over, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority

Apologies: Jessica Bawden, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group

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

576. Announcements, apologies and declarations of interest

The Mayor stated that Covid-19 continued to have an unprecedented effect on businesses and workers across the region and that the initial impacts on local businesses and unemployment were only now starting to be seen. From February to July 2020 the number of people claiming Universal Credit within Cambridgeshire and Peterborough had increased by 107% to exceed 60,000. This rise in unemployment across the region was concerning, and there were many things which were not known about the labour market and the long-term economic impacts of Covid-19. In order to better understand the impacts of the pandemic the Mayor was trying to visit at least two businesses each week. The message he was taking from business owners was that there were reasons to be cautiously optimistic.

The Combined Authority was doing everything it could to support the businesses hardest hit by the impacts of Covid-19 and also those companies who could power the local economic recovery. This included offering free, impartial 1:1 business advice and helping local small and medium sized enterprises to access the Government's Kickstart scheme. The key message was that the Combined Authority was there to help and that

businesses and people facing unemployment across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough were not facing this alone.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Ray Bisby, Acting Police and Crime Commissioner and Jessica Bawden, Director of Primary Care at the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group.

Councillor Smith declared an interest in Item 1.6: Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Constitution as a member of the Local Government Association's Executive Board in relation to the LGA's model Code of Conduct and Constitution.

577. Minutes of the meeting on 5 August 2020

The minutes of the meeting on 5 August 2020 were approved as an accurate record, subject to clarification of Councillor Bailey's comments in relation to Item 3.3: A10 Junctions and Dualling. A copy will be signed by the Mayor when it is practical to do so.

578. Petitions

No petitions were received.

579. Public questions

No public questions were received.

580. Forward Plan

The Forward Plan dated 18 September 2020 was reviewed.

It was resolved to:

Approve the Forward Plan.

581. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Constitution

An Addendum report was published on Friday 25 September to reflect comments and additional recommendations made by the Audit and Governance Committee when it met on Thursday 24 September.

The Mayor invited Councillor Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to share the Committee's question on this item. A copy of the question and response is attached at Appendix 1.

In accordance with the requirement that the Constitution should be reviewed on an annual basis the Monitoring Officer and his team had worked on this with stakeholders, held a workshop with the Audit and Governance Committee and submitted the proposals to the Audit and Governance Committee for consideration on 24 September 2020. The Code of Conduct was based around the Local Government Association's draft model and had been adapted to reflect the Combined Authority's position. Officers

were confident that the proposed draft met legal requirements and recommended that this should be adopted now. Changes were proposed to the officer employment procedure to formally bring the Combined Authority into line with the constitutional arrangements of Constituent Councils. Whilst these local government arrangements did not strictly apply to the Combined Authority it was considered that adopting them voluntarily would represent best practice. The proposed procedure was consistent with the views expressed by the Committee on Standards in Public Life. Specific arrangements were proposed for dealing with interim appointments due to the requirement to have the three statutory officers in post and in order to be transparent about how the Combined Authority made interim appointments. A number of officers within the Combined Authority's structure would be classed as deputy chief officers and it was recommended that matters relating to their employment should be reserved to the Chief Executive/ Head of Paid Service.

The Mayor stated that he had received notice from two Members of their wish to move amendments to the recommendations. He also wished to propose an amendment of his own and would take that first.

The Mayor, seconded by Mr Adams, proposed the following amendment (additions in **bold text**, deletions struck through):

1. To approve, and adopt the revisions to the Constitution detailed in this report with effect from 1 November 2020, **subject to the following change:**

That the proposed Officer Employment Procedure Rules be amended so as to:

i. Delete paragraphs 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4

~~3.2 Where it is proposed to appoint a Monitoring Officer, Section 73 Officer (Chief Finance Officer) or Chief Officer on an interim basis and such an appointment is to last for a period of less than nine months pending the appointment of a permanent Monitoring Officer, Section 73 Officer (Chief Finance Officer) or Chief Officer, the Chief Executive will make all necessary arrangements in connection with the appointment subject to the designation of any officer as the Monitoring Officer or Section 73 Officer on an interim basis being reserved to the Combined Authority Board.~~

~~3.3 Where it is proposed to appoint a Head of Paid Service [Chief Executive] on an interim basis and such an appointment is to last for a period of less than nine months pending the appointment of a permanent Head of Paid Service, the Mayor will make all necessary arrangements in connection with the appointment subject to an such appointment being reported to the next meeting of the Combined Authority Board for ratification. No appointment of an Interim Head of Paid Service shall take effect until it has been ratified by the Combined Authority Board.~~

~~3.4 Where it is proposed to appoint a Head of Paid Service (Chief Executive), Monitoring Officer, Section 73 Officer (Chief Finance Officer) or Chief Officer on an interim basis and such an appointment is to last for a period of more than nine~~

~~months or such an appointment was originally made under paragraphs 3.2 or 3.3 above but is to extend beyond nine months, the Employment Committee will make all necessary arrangements in connection with the appointment or the extension of the appointment as the case may be. Any such decision as to the appointment or the extension of the appointment of an interim Head of Paid Service (Chief Executive), Monitoring Officer or Section 73 Officer (Chief Finance Officer) shall be by way of recommendation to the Combined Authority Board.~~

2. Insert new paragraph 3.2:

3.2 Where it is necessary to appoint an interim Head of Paid Service [Chief Executive], Monitoring Officer, or Section 73 Officer [Chief Finance Officer] on an urgent basis that appointment shall be made by the Employment Committee.

3. Renumber section 3 accordingly

Councillor Herbert voiced strong objections to the Mayor's decision to propose his own amendment without notice before considering those amendments proposed by other members of the Board of which he had been given prior notice. The Monitoring Officer confirmed that the order in which amendments were considered was subject to the Chair's discretion.

Councillor Count thanked Councillor Herbert for sharing his initial thoughts on moving an amendment to the recommendations which had prompted discussion of this issue at the Leaders' Strategy meeting the previous day. In Councillor Count's view, the Mayor's amendment represented an appropriate end result of those discussions. The key change would be that any future appointments of an interim Chief Executive, Monitoring Officer or Chief Finance Officer would be made by the Employment Committee rather than by the Mayor. Given the significance of these appointments he considered it right that the Employment Committee should be convened to make these appointments.

On being put to the vote the amendment was carried by a majority vote in favour.

Councillor Herbert, seconded by Councillor Smith, proposed the following amendment to the amended recommendations:

1. Delete paragraph 3.2:

~~3.2—Where it is necessary to appoint an interim Head of Paid Service [Chief Executive], Monitoring Officer, or Section 73 Officer [Chief Finance Officer] on an urgent basis that appointment shall be made by the Employment Committee.~~

2. Insert new paragraphs 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4:

3.2 Where it is necessary to appoint an interim Head of Paid Service [Chief Executive], Monitoring Officer, Section 73 Officer (Chief Finance Officer) on an urgent basis that appointment shall be by way of a recommendation to the Combined Authority Board from a sub-

committee of the Employment Committee made up of the Mayor [or the Deputy Mayor acting in their place] and three Members of the Employment Committee [or their Substitute Members acting in their place].

- 3.3 Where it is necessary to appoint an interim Chief Officer on an urgent basis that appointment shall be made by a sub-committee of the Employment Committee made up of the Mayor [or the Deputy Mayor acting in their place] and three Members of the Employment Committee [or their Substitute Members acting in their place].**
- 3.4 The sub-committee referred to at paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 above shall be known as the Urgent Appointments Sub-Committee and shall be chaired by the Mayor or the Deputy Mayor acting in their place.**

Speaking to the amendment, Councillor Herbert commented that the Combined Authority did not in his view have a good record on employment practice in relation to senior staff and this had impacted negatively on its reputation. He welcomed the proposed involvement of the Employment Committee in senior appointments in future. However, he judged that the proposed inclusion of all constituent council leaders on the Committee would make it too large and unwieldy. Instead, his preference would be for the establishment of a smaller sub-committee to consider urgent interim appointments. Councillor Herbert felt that the Combined Authority needed to adopt the same processes as local authorities, although he judged that the situation was not helped by a lack of guidance on this from Government. In his view there had been too many occasions when decisions had been made by a single person and then ratified. In future, he wanted to see the wide advertisement of vacancies and a clear selection process in place.

Councillor Count commented that he saw value in Councillor Herbert's amendment in that it had prompted the discussion which had led to the amendment moved by the Mayor, but that he was unable to support it. The Combined Authority operated under different arrangements to local authorities, but the proposals within the report would see the Combined Authority incorporating local authority best practice where this was appropriate. Given the significance to the organisation of the appointment of its statutory officers he would want all constituent councils to have the opportunity to be actively involved in making these appointments, rather than simply being invited to ratify them.

Councillor Smith spoke in support of Councillor Herbert's amendment which she saw as a welcome alignment with Constituent Councils' practice. She saw no reason why the Combined Authority should not adopt the same approach which she judged to be both business-like and transparent.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was lost.

Councillor Smith, seconded by Councillor Herbert, proposed the following amendment to the amended recommendations:

1. To approve, and adopt the revisions to the Constitution detailed in this report with effect from 1 November 2020 **with the exception of:**

a) the Code of Conduct, until such time as the Local Government Association (LGA) Model Code of Conduct is published in final form.

Speaking to the amendment, Councillor Smith commented that she judged that it was inadvisable to adopt a code of conduct that was based on a model that was only a consultation document at present. She understood the wish to put in place a more robust code of conduct, but she did not feel the current version was suitable for the Combined Authority.

The Mayor sought clarification of whether the final version of the LGA Model Code of Conduct would be automatically adopted into the Combined Authority's Constitution if the Board approved the draft Code currently before it. The Monitoring Officer stated that this would not be the case. Any changes proposed following review of the final version of the LGA Model Code of Conduct would be brought back to the Board for approval via the Audit and Governance Committee.

Councillor Herbert expressed himself to be mystified about why it was proposed to adopt a Code of Conduct based on a version which remained a work in progress. The Monitoring Officer stated that whilst the Code of Conduct before the Board was based on the draft LGA Model it still represented an improvement on the Combined Authority's current Code. It had been produced by a team with wide experience and expert knowledge and it was, in his professional opinion, fit for purpose. There was no legal requirement to adopt a common standard in relation to the Code of Conduct, but the LGA's final version could be taken back to the Audit and Governance Committee to review and to consider whether it needed to be brought back to the Board.

Councillor Bailey commented that the proposed Code of Conduct contained some helpful updates with regards to Members acting in their capacity as a councillor. The lack of consequences for failure to comply with the Code was in her view an issue, but one which went wider than the Combined Authority. On her reading, Councillor Bailey was content with the draft before the Board, but she asked that Councillor Smith should elaborate on her reservations about the detail of the Code of Conduct so that Members could take these fully into account when considering whether or not the proposed Code of Conduct should be approved.

Councillor Smith stated that there was much in the proposed Code of Conduct which was good, but there were also several points which she found unacceptable. This included the statement that in undertaking their role, Members would 'ensure that public resources are used prudently and in the public interest'. Her concern was that whilst she was able to vote against any proposals which she deemed did not meet this test, this would not prevent it being approved if other Board members voted differently. To address this she suggested that the commitment should be changed from 'I will...' to 'I will endeavour...'. Councillor Smith's second concern related to the section dealing with confidentiality and access to information which she felt required more information and could potentially conflict with the organisation's whistle-blowing policy. Her third concern related to the section on breaches of the Code of Conduct as she took exception to the phrase, 'Most Members conduct themselves appropriately and in

accordance with these standards.’ Her view was that the starting point should be an expectation that all Members would conduct themselves in this manner.

Councillor Boden acknowledged the points raised by Councillor Smith, but commented that these did not in his opinion appear fundamental barriers to adopting the proposed Code. He was though disappointed that these concerns had not been shared sooner. In his judgement it was preferable to adopt the version of the Code currently before the Board which he considered to be superior to the existing version rather than to wait until an even better version was available. In response to Councillor Smith’ concern about the requirement to ensure the prudent use of public resources, he judged that in casting her vote she was discharging that responsibility.

Councillor Count commented that the last time the Constitution was reviewed there had been a lot queries raised on points of detail which might have been addressed outside of the meeting and the same thing was happening again. In his judgement the three points raised by Councillor Smith did not render the document invalid. The Monitoring Officer had given his professional opinion that the iteration before the Board was fully workable and represented an improvement on the version currently contained within the Combined Authority’s Constitution. On that basis, he was not prepared to retain an inferior version even if the iteration before the Board did not represent a fully finished article.

Councillor Herbert sought an assurance that the Code of Conduct would be reviewed again when the LGA concluded its work on producing a Model Code. The Mayor stated that the Code of Conduct remained under regular review and that he had no desire to change that. He confirmed that he was content to look again at the Code of Conduct when the LGA had finished its work. The final version would be taken to the Audit and Governance Committee and then to a Leaders’ Strategy meeting where it could be discussed in detail and a decision reached on whether it needed to be brought back to the Board.

Councillor Herbert welcomed the clarification around declarations of interest contained within the proposed Code as he believed there to have been two occasions when an individual did not declare an interest or leave the meeting which this was required. He further welcomed the clarification of the right of appeal for senior staff following dismissal. The Mayor stated that the Combined Authority had always acted in accordance with employment law.

Councillor Smith commented that she had spoken to the Monitoring Officer earlier in the day in relation to the reference to Member use of resources. She used IT equipment provided by South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) rather than equipment provided by the Combined Authority and as such was covered in relation to this by SCDC’s Code of Conduct. The Monitoring Officer stated that Board members were as much members of the Combined Authority as they were members of their home authority. As such, its officers and resources were as much at their disposal as those provided by their home authority. Councillor Count commented that he did not have a Combined Authority laptop, but that he did on occasion use Combined Authority premises for meetings. He understood the inclusion of the section on Member use of resources to be a catch-all statement to ensure that Members were acting appropriately in this regard and to provide assurance to the public.

Councillor Smith further commented that she felt that it was inappropriate for a non-elected person to represent the Mayor at meetings and on other occasions when he had an elected deputy. The Mayor stated that there was a clear difference in his representative at formal or informal meetings and sought clarification of standard practice across combined authorities and the London Mayoral Authority. The Combined Authority Solicitor stated that the protocol relating to deputising for the Mayor had been contained in the iteration of the Constitution which had been approved by the Board in September 2019. The only change around this in the version currently under consideration was that posts within the Mayor's office, with exception of the Mayor's personal assistant, would become politically restricted. The practice of other Combined Authorities and the London Mayoral Authority had been reviewed in drawing up the draft. The Monitoring Officer stated that there was a distinction between those occasions where he was represented by the Statutory Deputy Mayor and those where he was represented by another person to enable him to manage the business of public life.

The Monitoring Officer sought confirmation that in moving to the vote, the Board was content to take account of the recommendation made by the Audit and Governance Committee to make representations to Government in relation to quoracy requirements for combined authority committees. This was confirmed with the consent of the meeting.

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

- a) approve, and adopt the revisions to the Constitution detailed in this report with effect from 1 November 2020, subject to the following change:

That the proposed Officer Employment Procedure Rules be amended so as to:

- i. Delete paragraphs 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4.
 - ii. Insert new paragraph 3.2:
 - 3.2 Where it is necessary to appoint an interim Head of Paid Service [Chief Executive], Monitoring Officer, or Section 73 Officer [Chief Finance Officer] on an urgent basis that appointment shall be made by the Employment Committee.
 - iii. Renumber section 3 accordingly.
- b) authorise the Monitoring Officer to update the Constitution with the recommended revisions and to make any consequential amendments.

582. Business Plan Update

The Board received a mid-year update on the Combined Authority Business Plan. This included a new section addressing the Authority's response to Covid-19. Two additions were proposed to the Combined Authority's list of key projects: the A141 Bypass and Business Board Growth Services. In addition, the Business Board/ Tracking of the

Local Industrial Strategy project had been re-named Business Board Growth Investment to better reflect the scope of the programme.

Councillor Herbert welcomed the presentation of the report as a clear way of sharing information. However, he judged that some of the biggest projects merited further detail. Specifically, he sought an update on A47 Dualling and whether Highways England's (HE) letter of 3 September 2020 meant that a number of projects including the A47 would not progress. The Director of Delivery and Strategy stated that business case documents had been prepared for the A47 and that there had been encouraging conversations with HE, so it was disappointing that this had not been included in the HE programme. Councillor Count commented that the A47 represented a vital part of the Combined Authority's levelling-up agenda. It was imperative that the Board receive formal feedback from Ministers or officials setting out formally how the A47 would be delivered and he asked that officers should press for this. The Mayor concurred, stating that the A47 was a priority project and that a timeline was needed from Government. The Director of Delivery and Strategy stated that representations had been made on this in the context of the spending review and that a further meeting was scheduled with HE the following week. He suggested that officers might bring a report on this to the next meeting when the position would be more clear. The Mayor accepted this offer and commented that he was also pressing hard on this and would continue to do so.

Councillor Herbert further asked for a public report on the projects contained within the Devolution Deal. The Mayor stated that he would be happy to bring that before the Board. Councillor Count subsequently commented that an update on Devolution Deal projects was due to be considered at the Leaders' Strategy meeting so discussion on how this might be taken forward was already in hand.

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

Approve the 2020/21 Business Plan mid-year update.

583. Performance Report

The Performance Report set out the position on delivery against the key metrics of gross value added (GVA), jobs and housing to the end of August 2020. There was a net upward movement of two projects and two projects were rated red.

Councillor Smith questioned the value of the historical data contained within the report as it did not reflect the situation in relation to Covid-19. Officers confirmed that the data did not yet reflect the experience during Covid, noting that data in relation to housing had been delayed as this was obtained in person through site visits.

Councillor Smith further commented that there had been a significant increase in the number of claims for universal credit and that whilst there had been growth in some sectors the situation was very difficult for others. She acknowledged the significant amount of work being done in response to Covid-19 by the Director of Business and Skills and his team and commented that she would like to see that presented to the Board. Mr Adams commented that the situation was evolving very quickly. The data

contained within the Covid-19 Evidence Base and Insight Report answered some of those questions and showed the direction of travel on some key metrics, but there was a need for more real-time reporting so that investment and support could be steered accordingly.

Councillor Count commented that the Devolution Deal represented a 30 year programme. The United Kingdom relied on areas like Cambridgeshire which were contributing positively to the Treasury so it was vital to get back on track. He was not willing to lower his expectations on this.

The Mayor highlighted the investment which had been made into business including recently through additional Covid-related funding, commenting that the impact of the right type of investment into a business was substantial. The Combined Authority had been able to deliver at pace due to the Business Board's work in this area and he hoped to be able to follow up on the Covid-19 response going forward.

The September Delivery Dashboard was noted.

584. Budget monitor report: September 2020

The report set out the updated financial position to July 2020. The Board's attention was drawn to two changes to grant income since the last report. These were a £486k allocation for sector-based work academies and high value courses in the area announced by the Department for Education which would be delivered through Adult Education Budget funding and £210k from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government for peer to peer business support grants. The fall in interest rates had impacted on the interest received on investments and there had been slippage in relation to the Health and Care Sector Work Academy. The capital programme reflected the adjustments approved by the Board in August 2020. In March 2018 the Board had considered a business case for Digital Connectivity Infrastructure. The medium term financial plan (MTFP) had not been updated to show that this had been approved so the Board was invited to confirm this approval so that the MTFP could be updated accordingly.

Councillor Smith commented that she understood that the Skills Team had been disbanded and asked whether this should be reflected within the in-year variances. The Director of Business and Skills clarified that the Skills Team was not being disbanded; two officers had been made redundant and would be replaced by officers at a higher grade. The intention was to create the Growth Co and this would be reflected in the draft budget and MTFP for the next and future years which would be brought before the Board in the coming months. Councillor Smith further asked for more information on the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) core funding and how it was spent, the LEP capacity funding and the £144k expenditure on Committee and Business Board allowances. The Director of Business and Skills offered a note on this and confirmed that the figure relating to allowances was an annual sum and that it was spent in full. Councillor Smith further asked whether it was realistic to expect the capital budget to be spent in full given the impact of Covid-19. The Director of Business and Skills stated that this remained the case because projects had been selected which could deliver on this timescale and capital had been redeployed where appropriate. He remained

confident that the full sum would be spent in-year. The Mayor noted that savings had also been made through the re-structure of the Business Board.

On being proposed by Councillor Count, seconded by Councillor Boden, was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the updated financial position of the Combined Authority for the year.
- b) Approve the 2020-21 'subject to approval' budget of £1,040k for the Digital Connectivity Infrastructure Programme, in line with the Business Case presented in March 2018.

585. Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM) Special Purpose Vehicle Shareholder Agreement

The Mayor invited Councillor Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to share the Committee's question on this item. A copy of the question and response is attached at Appendix 1.

The Board was advised that incorporation of the Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) had occurred to create OneCAM Ltd and that the company would be capitalised after this meeting. The SPV was a tool to provide the Combined Authority with strategic control and the opportunity to review and monitor its activities while respecting its autonomy to deliver its work. The recommendation to appoint Professor Lord Robert Mair CBE as the Chair of OneCAM Ltd followed an interview panel. Lord Mair's CV had been published alongside the agenda for the meeting and it was proposed that he should receive remuneration of £80k per annum, a sum analogous to that paid for comparable roles within the sector. Recruitment of non-executive directors was underway and the Chair would have a crucial role to play in this process once appointed. Their remuneration would be commensurate with experience and would be confirmed when the appointments were recommended. The global search firm Redgrave had been engaged to identify suitable candidates for the role of chief executive in addition to an open advertisement in The Times online and on the Combined Authority website and a number of outstanding candidates had been identified to date. The report also contained an update on the procurement process for conceptual design and a full report and recommendations to appoint would be brought to the Board in November 2020 via the Transport and Infrastructure Committee. Officers were working to update the Forward Plan to show when further updates on the SPV would be taken to the Transport and Infrastructure Committee and the Combined Authority Board and the Monitoring Officer also welcomed the opportunity to work with the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on this.

Councillor Herbert indicated his intention to abstain from voting on this item. In his view, the appointment process for the Chief Executive and Director of Strategy posts was opaque in relation to both its timetable and decision-making. He asked for clarification of the current executive directors of OneCAM Ltd and how the procurement process for the conceptual design fit with the timetable for the outline business case (OBC). Mr Hill, Chief Executive, stated that a worldwide executive search had been carried out for the chief executive role. A long list of eight candidates had been identified who demonstrated national standing and expertise and paragraph 5.10 of the

report set out proposals around the interview panel and timetable for these posts. Mr Hill expressed the hope that Board members would be satisfied that candidates of the highest calibre had been identified when they met them. The membership of the interview panel was yet to be agreed, but he would like to see it include Lord Mair if his appointment as Chair of OneCAM Ltd was approved by the Board. Both of the Combined Authority's Joint Chief Executives had been involved in the long-listing of candidates and Mr Hill undertook to share proposals on the interview panel and the timetable for the recruitment of the Chief Executive and Executive Directors with the Board outside of the meeting after discussions with Lord Mair.

Ms Sawyer, Chief Executive, stated that considerable work had been done around the timetabling of the OBC. Officers were developing the procurement process for the conceptual design based on the advice of the Technology Advisory Group. Initial discussions had also taken place with the market regarding the design vehicle and further details would be taken to the Transport and Infrastructure Committee with regular updates to the Board. The intention was that the procurement process would not impact on the OBC. Given the complexity of the issue, Councillor Smith asked that a summary of the timeline should be circulated in writing outside of the meeting.

Councillor Smith asked how many days per month the Chair of OneCAM Ltd would be working. Officers estimated that it would be around 1.5 days per week or around 35 days per year. This figure had been discussed with Lord Mair.

Councillor Count commented that Lord Mair had an exceptional CV and would, in his view, be a true asset to the project. Schedule 1 to the report helpfully set out the division of responsibilities between the Combined Authority and OneCAM Ltd and he suggested that, as a next step, officers should give consideration to producing a risk matrix based on this in order to identify both the risks and mitigations in good time. He further suggested that this would also be a good approach to take in relation to the OBC and asked that this should also be considered.

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

- a) Agree to enter into a Shareholder and SPV Agreement on the Heads of Terms accompanying this report.
- b) Approve the appointment of Lord Robert Mair as Chair of the SPV.
- c) Agree the annual remuneration for the role of Chair as £80,000.
- d) Agree to enter into a Service Level Agreement between the Combined Authority and SPV, to provide the SPV with operational resources and support.
- e) Approve the drawdown of £2,706,905 for the Delivery and Strategy Writing and a further £1,516,823 for Client Side Advisory from the Medium Term Financial Plan.

The Mayor commented that this was an exciting time for the CAM project. Whilst acknowledging the engineering challenges which it posed he emphasised the impact

which it would have on Cambridgeshire and the surrounding area. The gravitas of the project was underlined by its ability to attract someone of the calibre of Lord Mair to want to take on the role of Chair of OneCAM Ltd. He recognised that there were differences of opinion within the Board in relation to SPVs, but drew attention to the success of its use in relation to the University of Peterborough.

586. A10 Dualling and junctions

The Mayor invited Councillor Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to share the Committee's question on this item. A copy of the question and response is attached at Appendix 1.

The Board received an update on the A10 Dualling and Junctions project and was invited to approve the release of the capital budget of £2 million allocated as "subject to approval" within the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP). A further request was made to delegate authority to the Director of Delivery and Strategy, in consultation with the Chair of the Transport and Infrastructure Committee, to develop and procure outline business case stage suppliers following a Major Route Network (MRN)/ Large Local Majors (LLM) funding decision by Department for Transport (DfT). The importance of the A10 corridor was well-known to the Board. Work on the strategic outline business case was now complete and a virtual public exhibition had been arranged to support Covid-safe public engagement which had been very well attended. The exhibition had covered the seven options under consideration and which, subject to the response from the DfT, would be included in the full public consultation. The Combined Authority had previously submitted two funding bids for junctions and dualling. Approval had been given in the Spring Budget to proceed to the next stage of work in relation to junctions and officers continued to press for a decision to proceed with work on dualling too. The request in the report to delegate authority to the Director of Delivery and Strategy sought to maintain programme pace by allowing officers to proceed under delegated authority as soon as DfT approval was received. The Board would be updated on the outcome of the DfT's decision when this was known.

It was proposed that the Combined Authority would procure, via Cambridgeshire County Council, an employer's agent to manage the technical aspects of developing the elements of the OBC. The project would be led and managed by a project board and monitoring and evaluation criteria would be set and an external evaluation conducted at the next gateway stage. Discussions would continue in relation to interfaces with other key projects and delivery of the scheme would continue to align with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review (CPIER) report, the Local Transport Plan, the recommendations of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Climate Change Commission and feedback from constituent councils and the public. The Strategic Outline business case (SOBC) had been delivered within budget and it was intended that the OBC stage would be jointly funded with DfT and Combined Authority contributions.

Councillor Smith commented that there had been overwhelming support in response to the virtual exhibition to something being done to improve the A10, but that her recollection was that there had not been decisive support in favour of any particular option. She asked when a decision from the DfT could realistically be expected. Officers stated that discussions were continuing with the DfT and engagement

remained positive. Whilst it would not be appropriate to attempt to pre-judge the DfT's decision there had been a commitment made in the Budget to progress work on junctions and officers were seeking to link the A10 junctions and dualling projects. With regards to the public exhibition, there had been strong public support in favour of an intervention with a degree of preference for dualling, but there had not been a clear preference expressed between the routes proposed. At the current time all options remained open ahead of the formal public consultation.

Councillor Herbert commented that the project was entirely dependent on the DfT's decision and sought clarification of when it was envisaged that either the £2m capital budget or any other approved funding would be spent. The Head of Transport stated that it would be imprudent to start engaging a supply chain ahead of a decision from the DfT so it was not proposed to use the funding until this decision was received.

Councillor Bailey commented that the only option which attracted more agreement than disagreement at the public exhibition was dualling and that support for the dualling option was overwhelming amongst East Cambridgeshire's residents. The current congestion on the A10 had a significant knock-on effect on other roads in the area and there was a need to get traffic back onto the strategic road network where it belonged. Alongside this was the wish to take traffic off of the road network completely by offering viable transport alternatives, including considering how the proposals would link up with the north portal of the CAM at Waterbeach. Councillor Bailey welcomed officers' recognition of the need to future-proof the proposals. East Cambridgeshire District Council also deemed that it would be important to have a separate off-road cycle route between Cambridge and Ely.

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

- a) Note progress since the August board report;
- b) Approve the release of the capital budget of £2 million allocated as "subject to approval" within the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP);
- c) Delegate authority to the Director of Delivery and Strategy, in consultation with the Chair of the Transport and Infrastructure Committee, to develop and procure OBC stage suppliers following a Major Route Network (MRN)/ Large Local Majors (LLM) funding decision by Department for Transport (DfT).

The vote in favour included all of the Members appointed by Constituent Councils, including the members appointed by Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council.

The meeting adjourned between 1.10pm and 1.23pm.

587. Market Towns programme investment prospectus: approval of first tranche of programmes

The Mayor stated that the report contained four appendices which were exempt from publication under Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act

1972, as amended, in that it would not be in the public interest for this information to be disclosed: information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person, including the authority holding that information. He asked whether any member of the Board wished to discuss the exempt appendices. No member expressed the wish to do so.

The Mayor invited Councillor Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to share the Committee's question on this item. A copy of the question and response is attached at Appendix 1.

The Board's approval was sought for the first tranche of proposals received for Huntingdonshire and Fenland under the Market Towns Programme Investment Prospectus. All of the proposals had been independently assessed and appraised. Officers continued to work with local authority leads and further proposals would be brought before the Board in November 2020 and January 2021.

Councillor Smith asked how local communities were involved in developing the plans and what on-going consultation and flexibility to adapt was built into this. Officers stated that 'town teams' had been established to ensure local consultation and engagement. Regular meetings and workshops had been held with local stakeholders and these had informed the development of each town's Masterplan. Work was now looking at the funding to address the priorities identified in those Masterplans. Town team leads continued to work to ensure that the projects identified would deliver to this and that they reflected the evolving Covid situation. The Mayor stated that the Masterplans had been driven by district councils who had engaged with local stakeholders. He had then met with council leaders to discuss the proposals which these discussions had generated.

Councillor Fuller commented that there had been extensive stakeholder consultation by Huntingdonshire District Council. As projects moved into the delivery phase with costed proposals a full consultation could take place. The Huntingdonshire Masterplan had been approved pre-Covid in February 2020 and so this would need to be reviewed in light of the changed situation.

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

Approve the first tranche of project proposals received for Huntingdonshire and Fenland under the Market Towns Programme Investment Prospectus.

By recommendation to the Combined Authority Board

Recommendations from the Transport and Infrastructure Committee

588. CAM outline business case non-statutory consultation (central tunnel section) summary report

The Board received a report setting out the findings of the CAM outline business case non-statutory consultation (tunnel section). The findings had been reported to the Transport and Infrastructure Committee on 9 September 2020 where they had been endorsed unanimously. Ms Sawyer, Chief Executive, stated that there had been a fantastic response to the consultation with up to 84% support in relation to the CAM proposals.

The findings of the summary report were noted.

589. Response to England's Economic Heartlands transport strategy consultation

The Board considered the proposed response to England's Economic Heartland's (EEH) transport strategy consultation on a sub-national transport body and connectivity study. The Combined Authority had Associate Member status of EEH. The five proposed policy priorities within the EEH Transport Strategy were generally aligned to the Combined Authority's growth ambitions, business plan and Local Transport Plan, although there was a recognition that these priorities would need to be reviewed in the light of Covid-19. Work on the Peterborough/ Northampton/ Oxford corridor was at scoping stage and work was in hand to ensure that this aligned with the Combined Authority's work on the A47. The proposed response had been presented to the Transport and Infrastructure Committee on 9 September 2020 where it was endorsed by a majority of those present. The Committee had concluded that EEH needed to clarify its geography.

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

Approve the public consultation response to the England Economic Heartland's (EEH) Transport Strategy and proposal for a sub-national transport body.

Councillor Herbert left the meeting at 1.40pm.

590. Bus reform

The Mayor invited Councillor Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to share the Committee's question on this item. A copy of the question and response is attached at Appendix 1.

Covid-19 continued to have a significant impact on the bus market. In response to this, the Transport and Infrastructure Committee had agreed unanimously on 9 September 2020 to amend the Bus Reform Task Force milestones. The Mayor stated that Covid-

19 had had a significant impact on bus use. Conversations were continuing about this with Government and significant work was being done at officer level by both the Combined Authority and Cambridgeshire County Council.

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

Approve the remaining £1.2 million budget provision set out in the Medium Term Financial Plan, to be used to fund short-term innovation trials to inform subsequent reform proposals, and to delegate the detailed allocation of the budget to trials to the Director of Delivery and Strategy in consultation with the Chair of the Committee, subject to reporting the detail back to future Transport and Infrastructure Committee meetings.

The vote in favour included six Members appointed by Constituent Councils, including the members appointed by Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council.

Recommendations from the Skills Committee

591. Sector-based work academy and high value courses

The Mayor invited Councillor Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to share the Committee's question on this item. A copy of the question and response is attached at Appendix 1.

The Board's approval was sought to allocate £486,297 to the Adult Education budget for sector-based work academies and high value courses once this additional funding was received from the Department for Education. Further approval was sought to delegate authority to the Skills Committee to spend these funds. The proposals had been considered by the Skills Committee on 14 September 2020 where they were endorsed unanimously by those present.

Councillor Holdich, Chair of the Skills Committee and Lead Member for Skills, commended the recommendations to the Board. The proposals were based on extensive background work and would meet a clear current and future need. He expressed his thanks to officers for their work on this. The Mayor echoed the endorsement of the exceptional work done by the Director of Business and Skills and his team in response to Covid-19.

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

- a) Allocate the £486,297, once received, from the Department for Education (DfE) to the Adult Education Budget (AEB).
- b) Delegate authority to the Skills Committee for the spend allocation of the £486,297 including:

- the spend of the funding of £241,361 across the 20/21 and 21/22 financial years for the creation of sector-based work academies
- the spend of funding of £244,936 to offer an enhanced one-year classroom based course for those students who have left school or college with no job, apprenticeship, placement, university or course to go to across the 20/21 and 21/22 financial years
- the spend on Sector-Based Work Academies and High Value Courses

592. Business Growth Service – full business case

The Local Industrial Strategy (LIS) consisted of five key parts and the Business Board was tasked with implementing these. The Business Growth Service was the vehicle through which it was proposed that this was delivered. Together, the package of measures being recommended formed a key part of the Business Board's strategy and would deliver one third of its interventions over the next six years. A number of conditions had been set for Combined Authority Board approval of the full business case at outline business case stage and all of these had been met. Two further conditions had also been imposed to ensure that the proposals had been adapted to take account of Covid-19 and that the impact of Covid-19 on Enterprise Zone receipts did not have a significant impact on this service. Once recruited, the chairperson would present a report on performance against objectives to every second meeting of the Skills Committee and Business Board and twice yearly to the Combined Authority Board.

Councillor Smith commented that Councillor Herbert had given notice of his wish to move an amendment to the report. Councillor Herbert had now left the meeting, but she was willing to move the amendment if another member was willing to second it. No seconder was declared and the Board moved to discuss the officer recommendations.

Councillor Smith asked about progress on recruiting a chairperson for the Business Growth Service. The Director of Business and Skills stated that a recruitment company was handling the process. The role had been advertised locally and on national recruitment websites and two applications had been received to date.

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

- a) Approve and adopt the Full Business Case (FBC) to mobilise the delivery of the Business Growth Service.
- b) Agree that the conditions for FBC approval set at Outline Business Case have been met, specifically:
 - i. Confirmation of EU funding, and the conditions set out in item 4.2 for contracting only upon further correspondence from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government.
 - ii. Appointment of a delivery partner

- iii. Submission of 3-year cash flow forecast; monthly for year 1 and annual thereafter.
 - iv. Contact / Involvement of HMRC to upskill Growth Hub staff
 - v. Discussions with local authority partners on availability of in-kind support via use of local authority office space, provision of secretariat and officer time.
 - vi. Submission of an independent state aid report covering:
 - i. ESF and ERDF application and utilisation;
 - ii. allocation of £2.335m of the authority's revenue budget to Growth Service Management Company Ltd;
 - iii. Management of Capital Growth Fund
 - vii. Submission of Sustainability and Environmental policy for the Growth Service Management Company Ltd
 - viii. Submission of evidence to support the claim of delivering 2.8 new jobs per firm receiving supported in-depth coaching
- c) Agree that additional conditions, to be considered post-Covid-19, have been met, specifically:
- i. That the Service has been appropriately adapted to support the Local Covid-19 Economic Recovery Strategy
 - ii. That the impacts of Covid-19 on contributing funding from Enterprise Zone, business rates receipts, have been appropriately considered.
- c) Delegate authority to the Director of Business and Skills, in consultation with the Lead Member for Economic Growth, the Monitoring Officer and the Chief Financial Officer (Section 73), to contract the preferred bidder to commence the Service during October 2020.

Recommendations from the Business Board

593. Local growth fund programme management September 2020

The Board received an update on Local Growth Fund (LGF) programme management to 14 August 2020. This included an update on the Getting Building Fund and a review of the lessons learned. A number of ideas had been proposed for development which officers would look to build in to future arrangements. The release of the final third of the LGF grant payment was awaited. To date, £89.2m had been paid out with £1.1m left to allocate. There were 16 live projects in delivery and a further seven projects at pre-contract stage. The Board's approval was sought to a project change request for the Photocentric project. This related to the site and scale of the grant proposals and there would be no negative impact on outcomes. The Covid-19 Capital Grant Scheme continued to make payments and monthly monitoring continued to show the jobs generated. Metro Dynamics and Eksogen were currently carrying out deep dives and the findings of these would be included in the next report to the Board. A review of LGF process was being led by Professor Andy Neely, Vice Chair of the Business Board.

Councillor Smith welcomed Professor Neely's involvement in the review of the LGF process and asked where the findings of this work would be reported. She further asked whether there was any risk that the final third of the LGF grant payment would not be forthcoming. Officers stated that the outcome of the LGF process review would be reported to the Combined Authority Board via the Business Board as part of the regular LGF programme management report. Sufficient projects were lined up to ensure that none of the remaining funding would be left unallocated.

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

- a) Approve the project change request for the Photocentric Local Growth Fund project.
- b) Note the programme updates contained in the report to the Business Board meeting on 15 September 2020.
- c) Note the funding position and forecast for Local Growth Fund Projects in delivery.

594. Growth deal project proposals September 2020

The Mayor stated that the report contained four appendices which were exempt from publication under Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, in that it would not be in the public interest for this information to be disclosed: information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person, including the authority holding that information. He asked whether any member of the Board wished to discuss the exempt appendices. No member expressed the wish to do so.

The Board was advised that the Business Board had considered two project proposals at its meeting on 15 September 2020. The Peterborough City Centre project would cost around £800k and would be run by Peterborough City Council which would also provide an additional £180k funding. The project had scored well against evaluation and was endorsed unanimously by the Business Board for approval. The Cambridge Market Place Project sought £700k to finance the redevelopment of the market square with no match funding in place. Appraisal of the proposal suggested a high level of risk if match funding was not forthcoming so the project was not recommended by the Business Board for approval at this stage, but the applicant had been invited to revise their bid and re-apply.

Councillor Bailey commented that the wording in the report around the Business Board recommendation was unclear and asked that this should be reviewed.

The Mayor emphasised the importance of working with town and city centre teams. The Cambridge City team was still looking at the options for the Market Place Project and he expressed the wish to continue working with them on this.

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

- a) Approve funding for the project ranked 1 (Peterborough City Centre project) in table 2.9 of the report to the Business Board based on the project scoring criteria and external evaluation recommendation; and
- b) Decline approval of funding at this time for the project ranked 2 (Cambridge Market Place Project) in the table at 2.9 of the report to the Business Board based on the project not meeting the scoring criteria

595. Covid-19 Economic Recovery Strategy

The Board was invited to review and approve the first draft of the Local Economic Recovery Strategy (LERS) for Cambridgeshire & Peterborough. The Director of Business and Skills stated that this represented a first draft of the strategy which had been produced in order to be ready for the end of the furlough scheme. It was proposed that a second draft would be brought back to the Board in November 2020 which would be more rigorously tied to the emerging evidence base. The current version had been co-created with Constituent Councils and the Greater Cambridge Partnership and represented an ambitious and optimistic vision. Thirty of the thirty six proposed interventions were funded, practical and could be implemented immediately. Work was continuing on the remaining six currently unfunded interventions proposed, three of which were at a relatively early stage of development. The proposals represented a whole economy strategy and officers would work with city and district councils in relation to this.

Councillor Boden welcomed the work taking place with city and district councils to make the strategy fit for purpose locally. He judged that it would be important not to over-promise on what could be achieved, but commented that the Strategy would still be able to make an important difference. However, he expressed reservations about the large number of interventions proposed, commenting that in an attempt to be comprehensive there was a risk of losing focus on maximising impact with limited resources and officer time. Councillor Boden commented that the cost effectiveness of the strategies was not set out and that in future iterations of the report he would like to see more focus, prioritisation and the cost benefit for each intervention.

Councillor Smith welcomed the proposal to bring a further draft back to the Board for consideration. She had discussed the current draft with the Cabinet at South Cambridgeshire District Council and in their view the green recovery was not sufficiently clear, interventions on specific support interventions for rural villages was lacking and interventions in support of young people were too hidden within the strategy. She undertook to send further detailed comments outside of the meeting.

Mr Adams commented that the work being carried out by Metro Dynamics would help inform the prioritisation of the various initiatives. The situation remained dynamic and highlighted the need to drive agility into the decision-making process. He judged that it was better to agree a direction of travel and start work rather than allowing perfection to get in the way of progress. The Mayor welcomed the clarity and value of this business perspective.

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

- a) Approve the first draft of the Local Economic Recovery Strategy (LERS) for Cambridgeshire & Peterborough.
- b) Note that the final draft of the Economic Recovery Strategy (LERS) for Cambridgeshire & Peterborough will be brought back in November 2020 for final approval.

596. Covid-19 evidence base and insight report

The report was withdrawn.

(Mayor)