



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE  
& PETERBOROUGH**  
COMBINED AUTHORITY

Agenda Item No: 1.2

## Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority: Minutes

Date: Wednesday 26 January 2022

Time: 10.30am – 2.30pm

Venue: Storey's Field Centre, Eddington Avenue, Cambridge

Present: Mayor Dr Nik Johnson

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

Co-opted Members: J Peach – Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner

Apologies: Councillor A Bailey, substituted by Councillor J Schumann  
Co-opted member Councillor E Murphy – Fire Authority  
Co-opted member D Preston - Police and Crime Commissioner, substituted by J Peach  
Co-opted member J Thomas – Clinical Commissioning Group.

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

The Mayor placed on record his thanks to John Hill, Director of Business and Skills, for his tremendous service to the Combined Authority across a broad and vital area of work. As well as leading the Combined Authority's work on the University of Peterborough, the Market Towns programme and the creation of the Business Board, Mr Hill had also led the Authority's Covid response and recovery which had provided a vital lifeline to businesses and individuals across the area. He left the Authority with the Board's best wishes for the future and for his continued success.

Apologies for absence were reported as recorded above.

Declarations of interest were made as follows:

Item 1.4 - Public Questions: Mayor Dr Nik Johnson, as a resident of Gransden Parish and Councillor B Smith as district councillor for Gamlingay (minute 138 below refers).

Item 3.4 – Market Towns Programme: Approval of Recommended Projects (Funding Call 7) – Councillor J Schumann as a Trustee of Viva Arts. Having taken the advice of the Monitoring Officer, Councillor Schumann spoke on this item but abstained from voting (minute 145 below refers).

Item 4.1: Local Transport and Connectivity Plan Update: Councillor Boden declared an interest as a Trustee of the community transport body which delivered the Route 68 bus service in Wisbech (minute 149 below refers).

Various reports: Mr Austen Adams as a Director of Metalcraft Ltd and a shareholder in the company.

### 136. Minutes – 24 November 2021

The minutes of the meeting on 24 November 2021 were approved as an accurate record and signed by the Mayor. The action log was noted.

### 137. Petitions

No petitions were received.

### 138. Public questions

Two public questions were received. The first was from Gamlingay Parish Council and a copy of that question and response can be viewed [here](#). The second was received too late to be considered and would receive a written response.

### 139. Budget Monitor Update – January 2022

The Board was invited to note the financial position of the Combined Authority as at the end of November 2021. Members' attention was drawn to the completion and clean external audit opinion of the 2020-21 accounts of the Combined Authority and its subsidiaries and advised that the accounts had been filed at Company's House. A pressure on the corporate staffing budget was highlighted which included the costs of temporary staff recruited to the governance and human resources teams. Staffing pressures within the Business and Skills team arising from expanded in-year project support would be recharged with nil impact on budget. As reported previously, some project budgets were behind schedule and the detail around these was covered in other reports on the agenda. There was also some lag in grant payments which was not untypical for these types of projects.

On 17 September 2021 the Audit and Governance Committee had considered a letter from PSAA inviting the Combined Authority to opt into national arrangements for the supply of external audit services. The Audit and Governance Committee recommended that this arrangement be approved.

Councillor Boden commented that the figures contained in the report were for the period to the end of November 2021 and that he would like to see more up to date figures contained in future reports. He asked whether any progress had been made since November 2021. The Chief Finance Officer stated that current figures would reflect a similar position to that set out in the report. The situation was monitored on a regular basis and a new internal performance and risk committee had been established to support this work. A report would be brought to the Board in March 2022 reporting in more detail on project underspends relating both to economies and slippage and seeking the Board's approval for budget carry-forwards where needed. Councillor Boden further asked whether the figure of £44k per annum for five financial years for external audit services delivered through the PSAA was a realistic figure. The Chief Finance Officer acknowledged that there was a risk that this figure could increase given the difficulties being experienced across the country with the recruitment and retention of auditors, but judged that the use of the PSAA national arrangements was the best way to mitigate this risk.

Councillor Smith commended the clear presentation of Appendix 4, which contained detailed explanations of material variances. However, her preference would be that future budget reports should contain more detail about specific projects rather than this being contained in other reports on the agenda.

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

- a) Note the financial position of the Combined Authority for the year to date.
- b) Note the completion, and clean audit opinion, of the 2020-21 accounts of the Combined Authority, and its subsidiaries.
- c) Approve the Combined Authority's continued use of the PSAA to appoint the suppliers of External Audit services for 5 financial years beginning 1st April 2023. (c£44k p.a. for 5 years).
- d) Note the increase in the ICT External Support budget per ODN 324- 2022.

## 140. Sustainable Growth Ambition Statement, 2022/23 Budget and Medium-Term Financial Plan 2022 to 2026

The Board had approved the draft Sustainable Growth Ambition Statement, 2022/23 Budget and Medium-Term Financial Plan 2022 to 2026 on 24 November 2021 for consultation purposes, together with the timescale for the consultation and those who should be consulted. 198 responses had been received in relation to the draft budget which represented a significant increase in response rate over previous years and a summary of these was included at Appendix 5 to the report. These included 174 email responses representing 180 individuals which were direct requests from constituents that the Combined Authority include funding for the Whittlesea Southern Relief Road's Strategic Outline Business Case in its budget. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee had reviewed the draft budget, but had not submitted a formal consultation response. The Board's attention was drawn to an additional £1m Mayoral Capacity Grant for 2022/23 only. Provision of £200k had also been made within the capital budget to fit out new CPCA office accommodation. A pipeline of potential projects had also been

produced following consultation with all constituent councils. The Section 73 Officer's statutory Section 25 statement was included for noting. This stated that the Section 73 Officer considered that the Authority's budget for the forthcoming financial year to be based on robust estimates made for the purposes of the calculations and that the proposed financial reserves were adequate to support the budget and Medium-Term Financial Plan.

The 'six capitals' approach had been taken in relation to producing the draft Sustainable Growth Ambition Statement (SGAS). This was intended to provide an amplification of the Devolution Deal growth ambition commitment to doubling GVA whilst also addressing the sustainability of that growth. There was no statutory requirement to consult on the SGAS, but the Board had chosen to do so and the feedback which had been received was included at Appendix 2 of the report. The majority of the respondents had endorsed five of the five pillars, with slightly less support for finance and systems. The Business Board had also been consulted and had been quite enthusiastic about the six capitals approach, although concern had been expressed that this might be perceived as retreating from the headline growth ambition of doubling GVA. The Business Board had also proposed a meeting with members of the Combined Authority Board to strengthen the dialogue between them. On reflection, Officers considered that greater emphasis should have been placed on the Business Board's response within the report. The draft Business Plan and refreshed performance management report would be submitted to the Board in March which would respond to the consultation feedback requesting more detail regarding implementation and the measurement of outcomes.

The Mayor welcomed the report and the inclusion of the consultation responses, which allowed the Board to hear the voices of the communities which it served. The intention was to establish a narrative and sense of purpose for the Board as a whole, whilst recognising Members' duty to advocate for their own local areas.

Mr Adams reiterated his comments from the previous meeting that the consultation process must be as meaningful as possible in order to inform the proposals before the Board. It would be closely scrutinised by the business community, and he was therefore disappointed that it did not make reference to the constructive feedback offered by the Business Board both during a meeting and in writing. The Business Board was not against the principles set out in the report. However, he believed it was imperative for the business community that the SGAS emphasised the continued commitment to growth and for that reason he would not be able to support the document in its current form. Mr Adams saw value in members of the Combined Authority Board and the Business Board meeting for a direct discussion. The Mayor welcomed this suggestion, but stated his belief that the Business Board had been listened to and rejected any suggestion that there was a movement away from the Devolution Deal commitment to growth. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough was a thriving area and the Mayor believed that the SGAS offered a new and inclusive direction of travel across the area, including for the business community. The SGAS could be revisited and refined over time, but it must belong to the Board and reflect a sense of joint purpose. His preference would be for the version before the Board to be approved without delay. The Chief Executive stated that all comments received in response to the consultation process had been given serious consideration, including those received from the Business Board.

Councillor Herbert welcomed the proposed discussion between Combined Authority and Business Board members. In his view, it was imperative to address climate change in a practical way for the benefit of a healthy economy and healthy population.

Councillor Smith welcomed the emphasis on the quality of growth within the SGAS as well as the quantity. In her view, this reflected the adaptation which was taking place around local priorities following the experience of the pandemic. In reaching a decision the Board could not focus solely on the needs of business, although this was an important consideration, as its responsibilities went wider than that. Councillor Smith welcomed the suggestion of a meeting or workshop between members of the Combined Authority Board and Business Board.

Councillor Boden expressed his disappointment with the report, which he believed did show a de-prioritisation of growth. He accepted that the position varied across the Combined Authority area, but commented that in the north of the county growth was still desperately needed and there was a need to move forward to all of the constituent authorities' mutual advantage. Councillor Boden also expressed frustration around the process for identifying potential projects for funding through the Medium-Term Financial Plan (MTFP) discussed at a Leaders' strategy meeting which he had understood would be an indicative rather than prescriptive process.

Councillor Nethsingha commented that growth for Cambridgeshire was of local, national and international importance and the aim was to make that growth sustainable. She highlighted the significant changes which had taken place in recent years in the way in which people worked and which would require thought around how to grow the workforce. She also believed that there was agreement amongst Board members on some key issues such as the need to support business to respond to this change.

Councillor Fuller expressed concern that the Business Board's views did not appear to be fully reflected in the report before the Board. If the Business Board had made representations in relation to the draft Sustainable Growth Ambition Statement, he judged that the Combined Authority Board should take full account of these. He would support the proposed meeting between members of the Combined Authority Board and the Business Board to discuss moving the SGAS forward.

Councillor Schumann commented that the Combined Authority's primary function was to deliver growth. In doing so it was important to take account of the public perception of the process and to be seen to be taking account of the feedback received. However, there were repeated references in the consultation feedback to a lack of detail and information. The Mayor stated his belief that the Combined Authority had made real progress in its willingness to engage with and listen to others.

Councillor Fitzgerald stated his belief that discussions around the Combined Authority Board's wider values and objectives needed to take place first in order to shape and inform the Sustainable Growth Ambition Statement. He also judged that more work should be done in advance of Board meetings to identify and address potential areas of concern to support greater consensus. For that reason, he was minded not to support the approval of the SGAS at this point, but suggested it might be withdrawn to allow further collective discussions to take place and brought back for decision at the earliest opportunity.

Having listened to the debate, the Mayor withdrew recommendation a) To adopt the Sustainable Growth Ambition Statement, pending further discussion.

On being proposed by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Herbert, it was resolved by a majority to approve the revenue budget for 2022/23 and the Medium-Term Financial Plan 2022/23 to 2025/26. In accordance with the Constitution, this was a recorded vote:

	For	Against	Abstain
Mr Austen Adams	X		
Councillor Chris Boden		X	
Councillor Wayne Fitzgerald	X		
Councillor Ryan Fuller		X	
Mayor Dr Nik Johnson	X		
Councillor Lewis Herbert	X		
Councillor Lucy Nethsingha	X		
Councillor Josh Schumann		X	
Councillor Bridget Smith	X		

On being proposed by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Herbert, it was resolved by a majority to approve the Capital Programme 2022/23 to 2025/26. In accordance with the Constitution, this was a recorded vote:

	For	Against	Abstain
Mr Austen Adams	X		
Councillor Chris Boden		X	
Councillor Wayne Fitzgerald	X		
Councillor Ryan Fuller		X	
Mayor Dr Nik Johnson	X		
Councillor Lewis Herbert	X		
Councillor Lucy Nethsingha	X		
Councillor Josh Schumann		X	
Councillor Bridget Smith	X		

The Section 73 Officer's statutory Section 25 statement was noted.

The meeting was adjourned from 11.16 to 11.26am.

## 141. Mayor's Budget 2022-23

The process for the setting of the Mayor's budget was set out in the Combined Authority Finance Order 2017. Paragraph 2.3 of the report set out the draft budget. The costs would be funded from revenue gainshare and no precept would be issued for 2022/23.

On being proposed by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Boden, it was resolved unanimously to approve the Mayor's draft budget for 2022-23. In accordance with the Constitution, this was a recorded vote:

	For	Against	Abstain
Mr Austen Adams	X		

	For	Against	Abstain
Councillor Chris Boden	X		
Councillor Wayne Fitzgerald	X		
Councillor Ryan Fuller	X		
Mayor Dr Nik Johnson	X		
Councillor Lewis Herbert	X		
Councillor Lucy Nethsingha	X		
Councillor Josh Schumann	X		
Councillor Bridget Smith	X		

## Combined Authority Decisions

### 142. Allocation of Additional Home to School Transport Funds - Academic Year 2021-22

The Mayor stated that this report related to decision to be made by the Combined Authority Board rather than a Mayoral decision as stated on the published agenda.

The Department for Education (DfE) had provided additional home to school grant funding in addition to the usual funding allocation during the pandemic. Due to an error by the DfE the Combined Authority had received less funding than it should. The figures before the Board represented the balance payment which had been agreed verbally by the DfE and sought approval of the proposed allocations once it was received.

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

Allocate the balance of Additional Home to School Transport grants in line with the audited expenditure figures of each Authority below:

Cambridgeshire County Council: £344,211

Peterborough City Council: £208,340

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority: £50,522

subject to funding confirmation from the Department for Education.

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

### 143. Transport Levy 2022-23

The Board was reminded that from 1 April 2021 the Combined Authority had resumed the direct exercise of a number of powers as the area's statutory Transport Authority which had previously been delegated to the two local Highways Authorities. A proportion of the funding would be retained by the Combined Authority with the remainder apportioned between Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City

Council. A full breakdown of the proposed allocations and rationale behind these was set out in the report.

Councillor Nethsingha commented that she understood the rationale behind the increase in costs to Cambridgeshire County Council, but that she was unhappy at the late notice at which the County Council had been advised of this change. In future, it would be appreciated if any proposed changes could be notified at an earlier stage to inform the budget planning process. She noted that concessionary fares were currently paid at a flat rate and commented that it would be important to have a serious dialogue with bus operators about the services being provided given that they were effectively receiving a flat subsidy to deliver these at present. It was disappointing that conversations around the shape of future bus services had been delayed and she would welcome a conversation with the Transport team around this issue. The Head of Transport apologised for the short notice given for the increased costs to the County Council. The distribution of funding for concessionary fares was managed in accordance with Government guidance and local bus operators had worked hard to deliver services throughout the pandemic, including accommodating the additional cleaning regimes required. He would be happy to meet with Councillor Nethsingha and County Council officers to discuss bus services and for them to attend the Combined Authority's meetings with bus operators.

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

- a) Approve the amount and apportionment of the Transport Levy for the 2022-23 financial year as set out below:

Total Levy: £13,229,793

- i. Peterborough City Council: £3,544,817
- ii. Cambridgeshire County Council: £9,684,976

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

#### 144. Market Towns Programme - Reprofiting of Budget

The Board was advised of a change to the published recommendation, whereby approval was sought for the re-profiling of the Market Towns programme budget as set out at paragraph 2.3 of the report. The proposed changes related mainly to delays with project spend due to Covid-19, including delays sourcing materials.

The Mayor endorsed a request by Councillor Boden that officers should look at the governance arrangements for decisions of this type and whether they required the approval of the Board.

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



Approve the reprofile of the Market Town Budgets set out in paragraph 2.3 of the report.

#### 145. Market Towns Programme – Approval of Recommended Projects (Funding Call 7)

The Monitoring Officer stated that Councillor Schumann had sought his advice on participating in this item given his position as a Trustee of Viva Arts. He had advised that there was no disclosable pecuniary interest and so it was for Councillor Schumann to decide whether to speak on the item. Councillor Schumann spoke on this item, but abstained from voting. Minute 135 above also refers.

The Board was invited to approve project proposals received under the Market Towns Programme from East Cambridgeshire District Council for the town of Soham to the sum of £470k. If approved, the funding would be used to provide business and commercial space at the Soham AgriTech Business Centre and the Spencer Mill Business Centre. To date, there had been six funding calls under this programme. These had resulted in the approval of 44 projects with almost £10.5m of grant funding being awarded which in turn had attracted almost £11.8 additional funding through partner match investment. The intention remained to dispose of the full budget by the end of the current financial year.

Councillor Schumann described the growth of the Viva Arts community group over its 25-year history from a group of 15 young people to a membership numbered in the hundreds. Its alumni included those who had gone on to pursue careers within the world of theatre and the arts, including in productions in the West End. It also offered skills for life to those following other career paths. The next phase in its development would see it seeking to offer training and skills opportunities to young people and adults within the wider community. The proposed location was close to the new Soham railway station and would see a number of unviable industrial units re-developed and brought into community use.

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

Approve project proposals received under Market Towns Programme received from East Cambridgeshire District Council for the town of Soham to the sum of £470,000.

Councillor Schumann abstained from the vote.

#### 146. Greater South-East Energy Hub - Mobilisation of Schemes and Reprofiling of Budget

An amended version of the report was published on 19 January 2022 following a request from the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) that some information should be presented as an exempt appendix. This information was exempt from publication under Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, in that it would not be in the public interest for this information to be disclosed (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)). Board members were asked if

they wanted to discuss the exempt appendix and no members indicated the wish to do so.

On 30 June 2021 the Combined Authority Board had approved a request for the Greater South East Energy Hub (GSEEH) to bid into the Sustainable Warmth competition funded by BEIS. BEIS awarded the Combined Authority a Sustainable Warmth Funding agreement of just over £118k and a Memorandum of Understanding was signed on the 19 November 2021. The programme would be mobilised between January and March 2022 with the delivery phase running from April 2022 to March 2023. All local authorities would be involved in this delivery. Section 7 of the report provided an update on the proposed financial re-profiling of the GSEEH which would be brought to a future meeting for approval.

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

1.
  - a) Approve the creation of budget lines as set out in 8.1 to deliver the services set out in the MoU for the £118,389,025 Sustainable Warmth programme.
  - b) Delegate Authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer and Monitoring Officer, to enter into contracts for Managing Agent(s), works or other, as required, to expend the funding for the Sustainable Warmth programme, as set out in 3.9
2.
  - a) Note the ongoing work with BEIS to produce a recovery plan for the Green Homes Grant (LAD 2 programme)
  - b) Approve the formation of the CPCA Programme Board for the Energy Hub programme.
  - c) Delegate authority to the Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer to approve the Terms of Reference for the CPCA Programme Board by 31st January 2022.
3. In line with the LAD2 variation letter received from BEIS, approve the corresponding reprofiling of the LAD2 and Public Sector Decarbonisation Fund budgets.
4.
  - a) Approve the creation and amendment of budget lines as set out in 5.1 (a to d) to deliver the services set out in the seventh variation to the Local Energy Capacity Support MoU for c.£2,164,358 and Social Housing Decarbonisation Fund – Technical Assistance Facility Online Hub MoU as detailed in 5.1(e) for £150,000.
  - b) Award a grant of £1.5m to The London Borough of Hounslow Council as Lead Authority for the Net Zero Investment Design & Scoping Programme.

- c) Delegate authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer and Monitoring Officer, to enter into agreements and approve the budgets corresponding to the BEIS funding agreements.

## 147. Progress Against Devolution Deal Commitments

The Mayor welcomed the collaborative approach which the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (O&S) had taken in producing the report before the Board. The Committee's careful deliberations had produced some constructive recommendations about the way progress against Devolution Deal commitments was reported going forward and demonstrated the real value which O&S could add to the way which the Combined Authority did business. He asked that his thanks should be conveyed to Councillor Dupré and to members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for their work.

The Board noted the Devolution Deal Report from Overview and Scrutiny Committee attached at Appendix 1 and the new format for reporting on Devolution Deal progress shown at Appendix 2 which reflected the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's comments.

## 148. Affordable Housing Scheme - Proposed Variation to Loan Relating to Former Alexander House, Ely

This key decision report was added to the Forward Plan on 14 January 2022 under general exception arrangements. It contained three appendices which were exempt from publication under Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, in that it would not be in the public interest for this information to be disclosed (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)). Board members were asked if they wanted to discuss the exempt appendix and no members indicated the wish to do so.

The Board's agreement was sought to extend the existing £4.84m loan facility to Laragh Homes on the former Alexander House, Ely affordable housing scheme from 25 months to 28 months. Work was close to completion, but had been impacted in the last two months by delays arising in relation to the Covid 19 Omicron variant and the sourcing of materials. The 25 housing units on the site all had prospective occupiers and it was proposed that the interest rate for the additional three-month period should be increased from 3.29% to a penal rate of 6% over base rate (6.25%). Officers judged that if the borrower was required to repay the loan in full on the original end date of 7 February 2022 that it was likely that they would default and that the development might not be completed.

In his capacity as the Lead Member for Housing, Councillor Herbert stated that the Housing and Communities Committee would receive a detailed report on Affordable Housing Scheme loans at its March meeting which would be shared with Board members. He commented that other affordable housing projects were dependent on the funds currently tied up in the loan and asked what assurance existed that the housing units would be sold and that the Combined Authority's loan would be repaid. The Mayor stated that he would also wish to seek this assurance. The Director of Housing and Development stated that all 25 units on the former Alexander House

development were under offer and that he understood that contracts had already been exchanged on around 11 of these. The Combined Authority held a covenant and legal charge over the site and would receive money from the sale of the completed units as a priority recipient. The anticipated receipts should more than cover repayment of the loan plus the increased interest charge proposed.

Councillor Nethsingha welcomed the proposed increase in interest rate proposed for the three-month loan extension, but commented that it was slightly concerning that the loan repayment would be delayed. She noted that this was one of a number of significant loans made under the affordable housing scheme and asked whether consideration had been given to selling these loans on. The Chief Finance Officer stated that this option had not been explored and that the market for such loans was likely to be limited, but that this could be discussed with the Authority's financial advisers. Loans made in relation to the affordable housing scheme formed part of the Combined Authority's investment strategy whereby loans were made in order to further the organisation's strategies and objectives.

Councillor Fuller commented that the circumstances described reflected the issues being faced nationally by the construction industry. Given that there appeared to be no issues with selling the completed units and the Combined Authority had adequate security over the project he was comfortable with the proposed three-month extension to the loan facility in this case.

Councillor Smith expressed concern at the implications if the development was not completed within the revised timescale or if similar requests arose in relation to other loans, but felt that there was little choice other than to agree. She would though want the position to be kept under close review and asked whether the delay in repaying this loan would have any consequences for other projects. The Director of Housing and Development stated that it would potentially cause a pressure on cashflow for the next few months, but that this was being managed by the Finance team. There would be no impact on schemes due to commence in the period to March 2022. A more granular report on the status of all affordable housing scheme loans would in future be taken to each meeting of the Housing and Communities Committee. The Mayor stated that the position would be monitored closely.

Councillor Boden commented that in this instance he judged that it was in the Combined Authority's best interest to grant a short extension to the loan facility on the terms proposed. However, he would not want this to be seen as setting a precedent.

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

- a) Approve the extension of the maturity of the existing £4.84m Loan Facility with Laragh Homes from 25 months (7th February 2022) to 28 months (7th May 2022).
- b) Increase the number of potential monthly drawdowns against the facility from 25 to 28.
- c) To agree that the rate of interest to be applied to the loan from 7<sup>th</sup> February 2022 will be 6% over base, until the loan is fully repaid.

By recommendation to the Combined Authority Board

Recommendations from the Transport and Infrastructure Committee

#### 149. Local Transport and Connectivity Plan Update

The Board was advised that work to develop the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP) was continuing following a meaningful engagement process. On the basis of that engagement it was proposed to conduct a re-write of the LTCP rather than a re-fresh as initially proposed. This would require a 12-week consultation period rather than the 6-week consultation needed for a refresh and would begin in May to avoid the pre-election period for a number of constituent councils. A number of technical workstreams would continue during the intervening period and there would be an on-going dialogue with the Greater Cambridge Partnership and the City Access programme.

Councillor Boden declared an interest as a Trustee of the community transport body which delivered the Route 68 bus service in Wisbech and stated that he had made this interest clear in previous correspondence with the Mayor on this issue. He commented that the revised timescale being proposed would mean a delay before proposals would be brought before the Board. However, some decisions were predicated on the assumption that the revised LTCP would be agreed much sooner. For example, funding for the Route 68 bus in Wisbech would finish at the end of March and this was a cause of great concern to local residents. Given the urgency, he suggested that a short report might be brought to the Board's next meeting on interim arrangements for bus services whilst the LTCP was being revised. The Mayor stated that he had been clear about the importance which he attached to bus services and connectivity. Officers were already looking into the particular issues in relation to the Route 68 bus and he asked that they report back to Councillor Boden as soon as possible. The Chief Executive stated that there was a need to respond tactically to the immediate challenges which existed. Officers were meeting fortnightly with the Greater Cambridge Partnership and a meeting would be arranged with Board members to discuss how bus services would be maintained during the intervening period. Maintaining the momentum of the LTCP was the right thing to do and if any issues arose in relation to timescales she would ensure that the Board was alerted to this in a timely way.

Councillor Nethsingha commented that there had been a degree of scepticism about the timescales initially proposed for the review of the LTCP and had these been acknowledged at the time it would have been possible to look at putting interim arrangements in place. She accepted the reasons for the delay, but wanted to act quickly now to look at the impact on services, particularly bus services. She would also welcome a separate meeting to discuss bus services. The Mayor stated that he had pressed officers on the production of the new LTCP, but had reluctantly accepted the revised timescale. He expressed his pride in the amount of consultation and work with partners which had been done to date.

Mr Adams welcomed the improved engagement with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and asked whether the revised timescale for the LTCP would impact

on any GCP projects. He further asked whether any short-term mitigations were being considered and whether it was worth focusing on such mitigations and delaying the re-write of the LTCP to allow time to reflect fully on the changing environment in which it would be delivered. The Mayor stated that this was essentially what would be happening with substantive work on the LTCP being paused until May.

Councillor Smith commented that the LTCP would have an impact on Local Plans, so it could not be allowed to drift indefinitely.

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

- a) Note progress on the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP);
- b) Provide feedback and agree to amended timetable for delivering the Local Transport and Connectivity (LTCP) programme;
- c) Agree to a programme of public consultation for twelve weeks commencing in May 2022; and
- d) Delegate authority to the Head of Transport to prepare the public consultation, and to brief members of the CA Board and Transport and Infrastructure on its content.

## 150. Fengate Access Study

The Board was advised that the Fengate Access Study sought to address existing problems with congestion. Peterborough City Council had secured £175k of funding to support the project and was seeking an additional £150k from the Combined Authority. The proposal had been considered by the Transport and Infrastructure Committee on 12 January 2022 where it had been endorsed unanimously.

Councillor Smith referenced an email from the Peterborough Cycle Forum which had been received by a number of Board members and commented that as the Lead Member for the Environment and Climate Change she felt it was important to ensure that their concerns were heard. To that end she proposed that the report proposals be amended as follows:

- a) Approve the drawdown of £150,000 to complete the Full Business Case stage of the project.
- b) Approve the slippage of the remaining in-year subject to approval budget and note the need for a further reprofile exercise once the revised project timeframe is established in January.
- c) **A study which prioritises, clearly models, and explains how schemes in Fengate will ensure the 15% reduction in motor vehicles miles commitment by 2030 is achieved in Peterborough.**
- d) **A study which prioritises walking and cycling, not motor vehicles (as per the user hierarchy outlined in the Combined Authority's 2017 LTP), and**

**clearly sets out how an LTN1/20 network in Fengate, with links to the City Centre, can be achieved.**

(Additional text in **bold**)

On a point of order, Councillor Boden commented that he felt it was unhelpful for a complicated amendment to be moved without notice. Councillor Smith apologised for the lack of notice.

The Mayor stated that he felt it was inappropriate that recommendations proposed by an outside body were being proposed which he had not had the opportunity to consider or discuss with officers. He adjourned the meeting to allow time for the amendment to be circulated to Board members for consideration.

The meeting adjourned from 12.45 to 1.10pm.

The Head of Transport stated that the comments from the Peterborough Cycle Forum had been received too late to be considered as a public question and he expressed reservations around the governance implications. He noted that the commitment to achieving a 15% reduction in motor vehicles by 2030 was a region-wide commitment whilst the LTN1/20 was an issue across all Combined Authority projects.

Councillor Fitzgerald stated that he considered the amendment to be unnecessary. Peterborough City Council (PCC) was committed to active travel and was delivering schemes and programmes reflecting this, but there was also a need to be realistic about what was affordable and practical. In general terms, the scheme before the Board was positive in terms of walking and cycling and reflected feedback from the public. The issues raised were already built into PCC's thinking, but the proposals contained within the amendment had not been through the proper governance processes and he would not be supporting them.

Councillor Smith questioned the position if the Board's ambitions for supporting sustainable travel and driving modal shift were not reflected in the projects it was funding. She had encouraged the Peterborough Cycle Forum to attend a future meeting to raise their points directly. The Mayor stated that he had read the group's email and recognised the importance of any group being able to challenge the Board, but he did not feel that the way that this had been done sat comfortably with the process of governance. For that reason, he would not be supporting the amendment.

Councillor Fuller endorsed Councillor Smith's comments around the importance of the principles set by the Combined Authority being translated into practice in its programme of works.

Councillor Smith stated her belief that too often issues such as cycling and walking were value-engineered out of projects and emphasised the urgency of responding to climate change. However, she took reassurance from the Mayor's response that some evidence would be brought before the Board that these issues would be factored in. On this basis, she was content to withdraw her amendment.

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

- a) Approve the drawdown of £150,000 to complete the Full Business Case stage of the project.
- b) Approve the slippage of the remaining in-year subject to approval budget and note the need for a further reprofile exercise once the revised project timeframe is established in January.

## 151. Fengate Phase 2 University of Peterborough Access

The Board was invited to approve the University of Peterborough Access Study Package Assessment Report and the drawdown of £1.8m for costs associated with the Outline Business Case Phase 2, to conclude a Grant Funding Agreement with Peterborough City Council and approve the submission of the updated application at Appendix 2 to the report to the Department for Transport's (DfT's) Major Route Network Programme fund.

Councillor Fitzgerald commented this project supported the ambitions of Peterborough City Council (PCC), including the need to support employment and growth. He emphasised PCC's commitment to active travel, but commented that the Council must also act in a way which was both affordable and practical. The widespread use of cars would continue while the county moved towards greater use of alternative forms of transport and active travel options and the measures proposed were designed to reduce pollution by easing congestion and improving the flow of traffic.

Councillor Nethsingha voiced some concern about the number of road projects in the centre of Peterborough, but acknowledged that this was not within the County Council's area of responsibility.

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

- a) Approve the University of Peterborough Access Study Package Assessment Report – Outline Business Case Phase 1.
- b) Approve the drawdown of £1.8m in respect of the costs associated with the Outline Business Case Phase 2, and to conclude a Grant Funding Agreement with Peterborough City Council on terms approved by the Head of Transport and Chief Legal Officer/ Monitoring Officer.
- c) Approve the submission of the updated application at Appendix 2 to the Department for Transport's Major Route Network Programme fund.

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

## 152. St Ives and A141 Strategic Outline Business Case



The Board was advised that public and stakeholder engagement had identified congestion, heavy traffic and road safety as key areas of concern. The proposals before the Board had been endorsed unanimously by the Transport and Infrastructure Committee (T&I) on 12 January 2022.

Councillor Fuller stated that Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC) welcomed the proposals. He noted though that HDC's representative on T&I had raised the issue of the proposed 18-24 month timescale proposed, and that this issue had also been raised separately with the Mayor. There were a number of developers awaiting confirmation of the A141 route and he was concerned that if a decision took that long they might press ahead without waiting for the agreed road plan. He urged the Mayor and officers to act as quickly as possible to avoid this happening. He welcomed confirmation of the St Ives element of the proposals contained in the report to T&I, but noted that no timescales were given and asked that firm timescales should be provided. The Mayor stated that he would work with officers to get a response sent to Councillor Fuller on this.

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

- a) Approve the development and costing up of the next stage of the project for Outline Business Case and Preliminary design.
- b) Approve the programme for, and costing up of, the Local Improvement schemes for St Ives.

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

### 153. A10 Outline Business Case

The Board was invited to delegate authority to the Head of Transport, in consultation with the Monitoring Officer and Chief Finance Officer, to develop the scope for the delivery of the Outline Business Case. The Board's approval was further sought to approve the release of £2m of Department for Transport (DfT) funding, to be spent in 2022-23, for the delivery of the Outline Business Case and to agree reprofiling the remaining 2021-22 budget into 2022-23. Subject to an extension to the existing DfT grant being agreed, the Board was invited to delegate authority to the Head of Transport, in consultation with the Monitoring Officer and Chief Finance Officer, to issue a capital grant funding agreement for the delivery of the outline business case by Cambridgeshire County Council. These proposals had been endorsed unanimously by the Transport and Infrastructure Committee on 12 January 2022.

Councillor Schumann commented that stop/ start traffic was one of the biggest challenges in relation to the A10 and that dualling of the A10 should ease congestion and improve traffic flow. This would reduce pollution and so would hopefully be consistent with the Combined Authority's environmental commitments. He asked whether the Mayor continued to support a business case that provided an off-road cycle solution and a commitment to dualling the A10. The Mayor stated that active travel was in keeping with the Combined Authority's direction of travel and that his preference

would be for segregated cycle-ways where funds were available. He could see some benefits to dualling the A10, but if funds were limited then safety along the A10 would always be his priority, not just for drivers and cyclists but also around the junctions. Whilst not an expert, he was not sure that dualling the A10 was the best environmental option and he would want to see expert advice on the best way to proceed. It seemed that both the Mayor and East Cambridgeshire District Council were seeking similar outcomes, but his priority would always be the environment.

Councillor Fitzgerald asked whether the strategic outline business case (SOBC) had produced a clear recommendation. The Head of Transport stated that studies on A10 junctions and dualling options had been carried out as part of the SOBC and that this was the basis for the outline business case (OBC) going forward. However, it was a different context now so some elements might need to be re-visited. The OBC would formulate recommendations for the Board to consider. Engagement was taking place with Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) officers in terms of the scope for a technical consultant to be engaged. The SOBC had identified a number of options, but there had not been a recommendation on a single route. The options identified would form the basis for discussions with CCC officers. This work would cover considerations arising in relation to the pandemic and would recognise the need to look innovatively at all of the options available.

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

- a) Note the outputs of the Cambridgeshire County Council Highways and Infrastructure Committee paper.
- b) Delegate authority to the Head of Transport, in consultation with the Monitoring Officer and Chief Finance Officer, to develop the scope for the delivery of the Outline Business Case.
- c) Approve the release of £2m funding from the Department for Transport, to be spent in 2022-23, for the delivery of the Outline Business Case, and agree reprofiling the remaining 2021-22 budget into 2022-23.
- d) Subject to an extension to the existing DfT grant being agreed, delegate authority to the Head of Transport, in consultation with the Monitoring Officer and Chief Finance Officer, to issue a capital grant funding agreement for the delivery of the outline business case by Cambridgeshire County Council.

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

## Recommendations from the Skills Committee

### 154. University of Peterborough Phase 3 Business Case

The Board was advised that the report recommendations had been considered by the Business Board on 10 January and by the Skills Committee on 17 January 2022 and had been endorsed unanimously on both occasions.

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

1. Approve the University of Peterborough Phase 3 Business Case
2. Approve the use of option a) in section 4.2, to use the existing special purpose vehicle Peterborough HE Property Company Ltd (Prop Co 1), for the delivery of Phase 3 of the University Programme, as the owner and developer of the second teaching building.
3. Consent, as shareholder, to modification of the Shareholders Agreement relating to Peterborough HE Property Company Ltd (Prop Co 1), on such terms as the Chief Executive of the CPCA in consultation with the Chief Legal Officer (Monitoring Officer), and the Deputy Chief Finance Officer (s73 Officer) may agree, to include at a minimum the maintenance by the CPCA of the drag along rights, described at paragraph 4.2 of the report to the Skills Committee of 17 January 2022 (link below) and in order to reflect the share allotments as noted in paragraph 4 below.
4. Consent, as shareholder, to Peterborough HE Property Company Ltd (Prop Co 1):
  - a) issuing the following shares:
    - i. To Peterborough City Council, shares to the value of £20m (in consideration of it investing £20m of Levelling Up Fund (LUF) funding)
    - ii. To CPCA, shares to the value of £2m (in consideration of it investing £2m of Local Growth Fund funding)
    - iii. To Anglia Ruskin University, shares to the value of £4m in consideration of it investing £4m)

and note that the share issue should be completed by 31 March 2022

- b) Agreeing revisions to the Development Management Agreement to extend the delivery specification in relation to the project management and delivery services and associated support services to relate also to Phase 3.
- c) Entering into a land transfer with PCC to acquire the Phase 3 land and then enter into an agreement for lease, and lease with ARU Peterborough in respect of the Phase 3 Building, and such consequential and other ancillary agreements on such terms as the Chief Executive of the CPCA in consultation with the Chief Legal Officer (Monitoring Officer), and the Deputy Chief Finance Officer (s73 Officer) may agree.
- d) Adopting a revised Business Plan, including such changes as are necessary to reflect the construction works and agreement for lease, and lease to ARU-Peterborough of the Phase 3 building in addition to the Phase 1 building.

5. Delegate authority to the Chief Executive of the CPCA in consultation with the Chief Legal Officer (Monitoring Officer), and the Deputy Chief Finance Officer (s73 Officer) to agree:
  - a) such changes to the Collaboration Agreement providing that changes to the delivery obligations (and respective timings) are made as described in 5.2 of this report.
  - b) In respect of the Collaboration Agreement, such changes in respect of increased target for student numbers, the curriculum model, and the site and building plan as described in paragraph 5.2 of this report.
  - c) The Development Management Agreement, such changes in respect of the provision of programme management services to Propco1, related to the Phase 3 construction project, are made as described in 5.2 of this report.
  - d) and to create or modify any such other documents as the Chief Legal Officer (Monitoring Officer) advises are necessary to give effect to the recommendations

## 155. Health and Care Sector Work Academy

The Board was advised that the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) had approved an extension to the existing Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) which would see the Health and Care Sector Work Academy project end in March 2023. As a result of this the Board was invited to approve a re-profiled spend. This proposal was endorsed unanimously by the Skills Committee on 17 January 2022.

Councillor Boden commented that there was particular issue in Fenland around access to schemes like this for residents from an ethnic minority background. It was also likely that the skills of some of these residents were not being fully utilised which represented a wasted resource. He would appreciate some thought being given to how to make best use of that resource. Officers stated that more partners would be included across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough as part of the re-focus and that officers would endeavour to reach wider communities.

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

- a) Approve the new profiled spend in accordance with the approved extension of the innovative employment pilot on recruitment and progression in the Health & Care Sector.
- b) Note the performance of the Health and Care Sector Work Academy to date.

## 156. Employment and Skills Strategy and Action Plan

The Board was advised that the Employment and Skills Strategy had been in development since April 2021 and that there had been significant engagement with stakeholders. The Leaders and Chief Executives of all of the Combined Authority's

constituent councils had also been consulted and their feedback had been positive. If approved, the action plan would be taken forward in consultation with officers from across the constituent councils.

Councillor Smith expressed her support for the proposals. The Economic Development team at South Cambridgeshire District Council was looking locally at what could be done and was keen to work in partnership on this. She particularly welcomed the focus on better outreach to schools and business.

Mr Adams commended the report as one of the best pieces of work he had seen from the Combined Authority, demonstrating a strength of purpose and a clear direction.

Councillor Boden asked to see the data explaining the population trends referenced in the report, as they appeared somewhat counter-intuitive. The Mayor stated that he would also like sight of this.

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

- a) Approve the Employment and Skills Strategy.
- b) Note that the Employment and Skills Strategy will be incorporated in the wider Economic Growth and Skills Strategy, due to be published in March 2022.

## 157. Growth Works Management Review - January 2022

The Board noted the Growth Works Management Review report for January 2022 which reported Growth Works programme performance up to 31<sup>st</sup> October 2021.

### Recommendations from the Housing and Communities Committee

## 158. Digital Connectivity Business Case

The Board's approval was sought for the Digital Connectivity Business Case included as Appendix 1 to the report and a £4.5m budget from the subject to approval line in the Medium-Term Financial Plan for 2022/23 to 2024/25.

Councillor Herbert felt that this area had not been led well nationally and that it would be good to continue working co-operatively at a local level to build on the work which had been done so far by the Combined Authority, Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council.

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

- a) Approve the Digital Connectivity Business Case included as Appendix 1 to this report.
- b) Approve £4.5m budget from the subject to approval line in the Medium-Term Financial Plan for 2022/23 to 2024/25.

## Recommendations from the Business Board

The Mayor reminded the Board that when the Combined Authority took decisions as Accountable Body it was committed to acting in line with the Combined Authority Assurance Framework in the interests of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area as a whole, and took decisions based on the recommendations of the Business Board.

### 159. Strategic Funding Management Review January 2022

The Board was invited to approve the process by which the Business Board would allocate recycled project funding. Project proposals would be submitted to the Business Board and Combined Authority Board for approval in the usual way. The recommendations had been considered by the Business Board on 10 January 2022 and endorsed unanimously.

Mr Adams commented that the scoring criteria were somewhat dislocated from the six pillars, but that the Business Board was constrained by the rules and obligations relating to local growth funding set out by BEIS. Category 1 would relate to requests for short extensions to existing projects whilst Category 2 would relate to levelling-up projects.

Councillor Smith asked how much funding would be available for Category 2 projects. Officers stated that this would be £5.7m. Mr Adams advised that this money had to be spent by December 2022 so under Category 1 the Business Board would be targeting increases in scope to existing projects where this added value. Category 2 funding would be used as seed funding for larger opportunities.

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

- a) Approve the revised strategic approach for targeting Category 1 of the Business Board recycled funds.
- b) Approve the criteria for the project scoring assessment of applications to the Business Board recycled funds.
- c) Approve the process for investing Business Board recycled funds as stated at Category 1 and 2.

## Governance Reports

### 160. Combined Authority Board and Committee Membership Changes January 2022

The Board was advised of a number of changes in membership to the Combined Authority Board and Committees which required ratification or were being reported for noting. In addition to the appointments set out in the published papers the Monitoring

Officer invited the Board to note the appointment of Councillor Jan Smith as Fenland District Council's substitute member on the Audit and Governance Committee for the remainder of the municipal year 2021/2022

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

- a) Note the appointment by Cambridge City Council of Councillor Anna Smith as its substitute member on the Combined Authority Board for the remainder of the municipal year 2021/2022
- b) Ratify the appointment by Cambridge City Council of Councillor Katie Thornburrow as its member on the Transport and Infrastructure Committee for the remainder of the municipal year 2021/2022.
- c) Ratify the appointment by Cambridge City Council of Councillor Richard Robertson as its substitute member on the Transport and Infrastructure Committee for the remainder of the municipal year 2021/2022.
- d) Ratify the appointment by Cambridge City Council of Councillor Cllr Niamh Sweeney as its member on the Skills Committee for the remainder of the municipal year 2021/2022.
- e) Note the appointment by Peterborough City Council of Councillor Mohammed Haseeb as its substitute member on the Audit and Governance Committee for the remainder of the municipal year 2021/2022.
- f) Note the named substitute representative for the Police and Crime Commissioner's Office (John Peach).
- g) Note the appointment by Fenland District Council of Councillor Jan Smith as its substitute member on the Audit and Governance Committee for the remainder of the municipal year 2021/2022.

## 161. Forward Plan – January 2022

The Board reviewed the Forward Plan for January 2022.

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

Approve the Forward Plan for January 2022.

(Mayor)