



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE  
& PETERBOROUGH**  
COMBINED AUTHORITY

**JAMES PALMER**  
CAMBRIDGESHIRE &  
PETERBOROUGH MAYOR

## Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority: Minutes

Date: Wednesday 24 March 2021 (reconvened Friday 26 March)

Time: 10.30am – 2.02pm (adjourned)  
Reconvened 8.00am – 10.12am (reconvened)

Venue: Virtual meeting

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 S Count – Cambridgeshire County Council (to 9.21am on 26 March 2021), Councillor L Herbert – Cambridge City Council (to 10.03am on 26 March 2021), Councillor J Holdich OBE – Peterborough City Council and A Van de Weyer – South Cambridgeshire District Council

Apologies: Councillors R Fuller, B Smith (substituted by Councillor A Van de Weyer) and co-opted member Councillor R Bisby, Acting Police and Crime Commissioner

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

A report setting out a proposal for a review of overview and scrutiny arrangements by the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny had been added to the published agenda with the consent of the Mayor.

The Mayor stated that during his tenure as Mayor he had always been most proud of the things that the Combined Authority did differently. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough was an area of great aspiration and the Combined Authority wanted to make a positive difference to the area as a whole. During the meeting the Board would be discussing the work taking place to look at the impact of climate change, to deliver a zero carbon, autonomous transport system, delivering higher education, supporting Market Towns and working in partnership across the local area to support economic recovery.

The Board would also be considering proposals relating to the £100M Affordable Housing Scheme. There had been some misleading stories reported about this, and the Mayor wanted to make clear that proposals had been received from Government for a revised housing programme and the Board would be considering whether it wanted to go ahead with these. Not all of the details were available yet, but the main thing was that Government had agreed to fund the housing programme to March 2022, which was

what the Combined Authority wanted. There would be additional scrutiny in the final year of the programme, but this was no different to the scrutiny being given to housing programmes in other areas. The Combined Authority Board had agreed that it wanted to try new, innovative solutions to tackle housing need in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. Government had now advised that the current housing programme could no longer be used for that purpose, but the Minister had offered an assurance that there would be an opportunity to look at more innovative programmes in the future.

Three thought-provoking conceptual designs for the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro had now been completed and were available to view on [the CAM website](#). These demonstrated the potential of the CAM to be a platform for sustainable growth and stronger communities across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. The Mayor expressed his thanks to Dr David Cleevely and the Technology Committee for the invaluable insight they had provided into the CAM's technical development, and to Daniel Ruiz, CEO of Zenzic, the organisation which was driving the United Kingdom forward as a global pioneer in connected and self-driving vehicle technology. The OneCAM team was also beginning the work of developing the network to reach as many communities as possible. It was already looking at extending the CAM network to Ramsey, Peterborough and Chatteris, but was also inviting communities and businesses where there was a demand for more jobs and new homes underpinned by a fast transport system to come forward and make the case for the CAM to come to them.

The Mayor placed on record his thanks to Dr Liz Robin, the Director of Public Health for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, for her tremendous efforts during the Covid crisis. In an unprecedented situation her contribution had been invaluable, and the Mayor offered Dr Robin his best wishes for her retirement at the end of April. These sentiments were endorsed by the Board.

Apologies for absence were reported as set out above. There were no declarations of interest.

#### 650. Minutes - 27 January 2021

The minutes of the meeting on 27 January 2021 were approved as an accurate record. A copy will be signed by the Mayor when it is practical to do so.

#### 651. Petitions

No petitions were received.

#### 652. Public questions

No public questions were received.

#### 653. Forward Plan

The Forward Plan dated 16 March 2021 was approved.

## 654. Combined Authority Appointments March 2021

The Monitoring Officer reported that he had exercised his delegated authority in accordance with the Constitution to accept changes to Fenland District Council's representation on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Cambridgeshire County Council's representation on the Housing and Communities Committee for the remainder of the municipal year. These changes were being reported to the Board for ratification.

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

- a) Ratify the appointment by Fenland District Council of Councillor Alex Miscandlon as one of its members on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the municipal year 2020/2021.
- b) Ratify the appointment by Fenland District Council of Councillor Susan Wallwark as one of its substitute members on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the municipal year 2020/2021.
- c) Ratify the appointment by Cambridgeshire County Council of Councillor Mark Goldsack as its member on the Housing and Communities Committee for the remainder of the municipal year 2020/2021.

## 655. Local Assurance Framework Annual Review

The Mayor stated that he would be moving an additional recommendation to those included in the published papers. This would be to refer the recommendation of the Audit and Governance Committee that there should be a presumption that meetings of the Business Board were carried out in public unless otherwise determined by the Chair to the Business Board for comment and consideration.

The annual review of the Local Assurance Framework had been completed and it had been amended to reflect revisions recommended by the Audit and Governance Committee and the Business Board. The published papers included both a clean copy of the amended document at Appendix 1 and a version containing tracked changes at Appendix 2. The Board was invited to approve the revised draft, to note that a copy had been sent to the Cities and Local Growth Unit (CLGU) for sign off and to delegate authority to the Monitoring Officer in consultation with the Mayor to make any necessary amendments once a response from CLGU was received. The Board's approval was also sought to the appointment of a Lead Member for the Business Board for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

The Board's attention was drawn to strong concerns expressed by the Audit and Governance Committee in relation to alignment with Nolan principles with regard to Business Board meetings being held mainly in private. To address this, the Audit and Governance Committee recommended, 'that there should be a presumption that meetings of the Business Board are carried out in public (unless otherwise determined by the Chair)'. It was proposed that this recommendation should be referred to the Business Board for consideration and comment before being brought back to the Combined Authority Board for consideration.

Mr Adams confirmed that the Business Board would give proper consideration to the Audit and Governance Committee's recommendation in relation to holding its meetings in public. However, the Business Board's role was to scrutinise investment opportunities and these contained commercially confidential information. Attracting these investment opportunities was based on protecting this confidentiality and he was concerned about the potential impact on projects being brought forward and the Business Board's ability to properly understand them and make recommendations to the Combined Authority Board. The Business Board had unanimously supported the appointment of a Lead Member for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to attend its meetings and he would want them to provide feedback both the Committee and to himself as chair of the Business Board if they felt that the Business Board was drifting from Nolan principles.

Councillor Boden commented that it was important that there was openness where this was appropriate. In his judgement there were some Business Board matters that could be considered in public such as reports on policy or the Board's effectiveness. However, he accepted the Chair of the Business Board's comment that there were some areas where public discussion could be detrimental to the Business Board's work and as such to the interests of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. His understanding was that other local enterprise partnerships (LEPs) did not meet in public and he felt that the chair of the Business Board needed the discretion to decide what matters should take place in the public or private domain.

Councillor Bailey commented that she believed that there were good and sound reasons why LEPs did not meet in public. The Business Board had demonstrated a nimble and highly effective response to the pandemic and it would be a matter of great regret if it should become politicised. The Business Board's unanimous support for the appointment of a Lead Member from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee reflected its wish to be open to scrutiny.

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

- a) Approve the revised draft of the Assurance Framework and note that a draft has been sent to the Cities and Local Growth Unit (CLGU) for sign off.
- b) Delegate authority to the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Mayor, to make further amendments to the draft Assurance Framework following feedback from CLGU.
- c) Approve adoption of the revised draft of the Assurance Framework following sign off from CLGU.
- d) Agree to a Lead Member from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee carrying out the role of shadowing the Business Board and agree the role description for that Lead Member

- e) Subject to (d) above, note that Councillor Murphy will undertake the role of Lead Member for the Business Board on behalf of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- f) Refer the recommendation of the Audit and Governance Committee, 'that there should be a presumption that meetings of the Business Board are carried out in public (unless otherwise determined by the Chair)', to the Business Board for comment and consideration.

The Mayor stated that the independence of the Business Board and its chair was vital to its success as a conduit to attract new investment into Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. As such, it should not consider itself under any pressure from the Combined Authority Board in reaching a view of the Audit and Governance Committee's recommendation.

#### 656. Review of Overview and Scrutiny Arrangements: Centre for Governance and Scrutiny's proposal

In a change to the published agenda, the Mayor exercised his discretion as chair to accept a report on a proposed review of overview and scrutiny arrangements by the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny (CFGs). This was to enable the Board to consider the recommendation in a timely manner as it would not meet again until 2 June 2021 and it was proposed that the review should begin before then.

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee had considered the CFGs review proposal at its meeting on 22 March 2021 and had formally agreed to seek the Board's approval to take this forward. It was considered beneficial for existing members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to engage with the review and so it was being brought before the Board for decision today.

Councillor Bailey commented that that she was happy to support the proposal as it had come from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. However, it would cost around £5000 so she would expect it be a good quality piece of work.

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

Agree that the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny carry out a review of the scrutiny arrangements for the CPCA.

#### 657. £100M Affordable Housing Programme

With the consent of the meeting, the Mayor varied the order of business from the published agenda to consider the Housing and Communities Committee recommendations on the £100M Affordable Housing Programme followed by two motions on notice from members of the Board.

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

Mr Hill, Chief Executive, stated that the Housing and Communities Committee had discussed the £100M Affordable Housing Programme and specifically the outcome of the review by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) at its meeting on 15 March 2021. The MHCLG review had concluded that the scheme in its current form could not be supported, including the ineligibility of 243 units at Northstowe. The Combined Authority would also cease its role in relation to the £70M Cambridge City Council affordable housing programme with immediate effect. MHCLG had made revised proposals to ensure the continued delivery of affordable housing to 2022, subject to a strict monitoring regime of the programme and evidenced claims. The Joint Chief Executives had advised MHCLG of the Housing and Communities Committee's recommendations to the Board and would further advise MHCLG of the Board's decision following this meeting.

Councillor Van de Weyer commented that it appeared clear that Government had taken away the remaining £45M and offered it back on different terms. He believed that the Mayor had received additional information in a separate letter from Luke Hall MP which he had not shared with the Board and he did not understand how the Board could make such a big decision without all of the information. The loan part of the affordable housing programme was at an end and any money coming back would need to be used for grants instead. There was no evidence before the Board that the same principle would not apply to the £100K Homes programme, so that too would come to an end. Councillor Van de Weyer asked for the reasons for MHCLG's decision to take away the £45M funding and for clarification of value for money in this context.

The Mayor stated that the £100K Homes programme had not ended and that funding would be found to deliver on the concept. The Minister had agreed to work with the Combined Authority on innovative schemes. The Government had not taken away £45M. It would be working with the Combined Authority to May 2022 on the delivery of the revised programme proposals if these were agreed by the Board.

Councillor Boden, Lead Member for Housing and Chair of the Housing and Communities Committee, commented that he was happy to commend the proposals to the Board. It was a matter of regret that the affordable housing programme would technically end at the end of March 2021 rather than 2022 and that it had taken MHCLG so long to respond on this. MHCLG had though extended the programme to 31 March 2022 so Ministers still wanted the Combined Authority to deliver on affordable housing. There were conditions attached to this, but it was not unreasonable that the Combined Authority could still get close to or even exceed the total of 2,000 starts on new affordable homes by March 2022, subject to the economic situation.

Councillor Herbert commented that the Nolan principles of openness and transparency had been mentioned earlier in the meeting and he felt that the Board was being denied critical information by the Mayor's decision not to share the second letter he had received from Luke Hall MP. There was no suggestion that the Board had ever been anything less than committed to delivering the 2,000 affordable homes, but this denied the Board the opportunity to make a collective response. Councillor Herbert asked

whether Government permission had been obtained for the £40M revolving loan fund and commented that £35.5M of loans made through the revolving fund which had delivered 33 affordable homes at an average cost of over £1M per home. He further asked whether the Minister expected houses to be completed by March 2022 or whether this related to starts on site. Councillor Herbert commented that he wanted the Board to work together as a team and for the affordable housing programme to succeed and he criticised the Mayor for the delay in resolving the issues raised by MHCLG and for dividing the Board. He also noted that the report had been introduced by Mr Hill without reference to his role as the chief executive of East Cambridgeshire District Council.

Councillor Bailey commented that she had followed this issue in detail and made representations to MHCLG. She challenged the assertion that the average cost per home delivered through the revolving loan fund was in excess of £1M, commenting that the loan fund delivered affordable housing at no cost to the taxpayer as all loans would be paid back. In her judgement it was a matter of regret that MHCLG had ended the revolving loan scheme and she noted a recent press release issued by MHCLG and Homes England celebrating the Haddenham housing scheme which had been paid for by the revolving fund. The queries raised by officials at MHCLG had taken months to resolve which had led to significant delays impacting on delivery. The Combined Authority had always been clear that it was working towards an end date for the affordable housing programme of March 2022 and this had now been accepted by MHCLG. The question of value for money and cost per unit had only been raised recently as an issue by MHCLG. To date, affordable housing units had been delivered by the Combined Authority at an average cost of £34k per unit while the revised proposals from MHCLG would cap intervention rates at around £45k per unit. Grant funding could be delivered by any local authority organisation, whereas the Combined Authority was seeking to innovate and offer points of difference. This had included the revolving loan fund, the £100k Homes scheme and community land trust schemes. When Ministers fully understood the approach being taken she believed that they would support it.

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

- a) Approve the revised proposals for the future delivery and completion of the £100m Affordable Housing Programme as outlined in paragraph 3.3 of the revised report to the Housing and Communities Committee on 15 March 2021.
- b) Note the revised arrangements for the operation and completion of the £70m Cambridge City Housing Programme.
- c) Instruct the Chief Executives to inform the MHCLG of the recommendation as agreed and bring forward a report to the Board on the arrangements for the implementation of the revised scheme.

The Mayor stated that the letter which had been leaked to the press told only half the story. When the Housing and Communities Committee had been presented with all of the evidence they had made recommendations to the Board based on facts and not

hyperbole. Government now accepted that the affordable housing programme was a five year deal, but it had not recognised the delays at the start of the programme caused by legislative delays which had cost around 500 homes. There were around 1500 homes in the pipeline and the hope and expectation was to deliver more, subject to economic conditions. The £40M revolving fund had been invested into Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and had brought forward both market rate and affordable housing. The region enjoyed high rates of employment, but housing costs were also high and national policies had not benefitted residents on low incomes in obtaining housing. The ambition to deliver affordable housing for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough was absolute and he would continue to work with Government on this, but he defended the creation of the £40M revolving fund and expressed frustration that it felt that the goalposts had continually been moved each time the Combined Authority had satisfied the queries being raised.

On a point of order, Councillor Van de Weyer asked why the Mayor had not made these comments during the debate. The Mayor stated that it was generally his practice to speak after the vote in order to preserve his neutrality as chair and to avoid influencing the vote.

#### 658. Motion on Notice from Councillor Bridget Smith

With the consent of the meeting, the Mayor varied the order of business from the published agenda to consider a motion on notice from Councillor Bridget Smith as the next item of business. Councillor Smith had sent apologies for the meeting, but the Monitoring Officer had confirmed that it would be in order to take a pragmatic approach and allow her motion to be moved by another Board member. Councillor Van de Weyer had advised the Board that he would be moving the motion.

Councillor Van de Weyer commented that it was clear that the Board did not fully understand what had happened in relation to the £100M Affordable Housing Programme and was not in possession of all of the relevant information. In his judgement, the best thing to do would be to appoint an independent person to carry out an urgent audit of the whole of the £100M Affordable Housing Programme. In response to a question from Councillor Bailey, Councillor Van de Weyer commented that he did not believe that an independent audit should not be too costly to carry out.

Councillor Bailey commented that she disagreed with the proposal. In her view, carrying out an independent audit at unknown cost would deliver the same outcome as the resolution which had been agreed under the previous item (minute 657 refers), but create a delay of several months. All correspondence relating to the £100M Affordable Housing Programme was regularly shared with Board members, with the noted exception of a private letter from Luke Hall MP to the Mayor.

Councillor Boden, Lead Member for Housing and Chair of the Housing and Communities Committee, commented that the motion mentioned the potential loss of £45M, but that Councillor Van de Weyer had acknowledged previously that MHCLG was also offering a further £45M under revised terms. A revised scheme needed to be put into place as soon as possible to secure this further £45M. The chief executives' negotiations would be reported to the Housing and Communities Committee and to the Combined Authority Board as necessary.



Councillor Herbert commented that he did not think carrying out an independent audit would necessarily delay matters. The published letter from Luke Hall MP did not say that the Combined Authority was assured £45M for a revised housing programme and he judged that the Combined Authority needed to build better relationships with civil servants

Summing up, Councillor Van de Weyer stated his belief that there was nothing in the motion that would cause any delay. Government had closed the Combined Authority's Affordable Housing Programme and was offering money on a different basis for a new scheme. In his judgement, it would assist public confidence in the Combined Authority's affordable housing programme to have a better understanding of what had happened.

On being proposed by Councillor Van de Weyer, seconded by Councillor Herbert, the motion was lost.

#### 659. Motion on Notice from Councillor Lewis Herbert

With the consent of the meeting, the Mayor varied the order of business from the published agenda to consider a motion on notice from Councillor Herbert as the next item of business.

Councillor Herbert commented that in his view there was public interest in the ending of the £100M Affordable Housing Programme by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG). The story was complicated, but collectively he believed more could have been achieved with the £100M which the Combined Authority had been assigned. There were large waiting lists for housing across the Combined Authority's area and those people were being let down. He did not have confidence in what would happen next and had heard no reason why the second letter from Luke Hall MP to the Mayor should not be published. Councillor Herbert did not believe that withholding the second letter accorded with the principles of openness.

The Mayor stated that he frequently received letters from Ministers that were not made public. The second letter he had received from Luke Hall MP was private correspondence and as such he would need the Minister's consent for it to be shared. Discussions about this were taking place with officials, but all of the relevant information had already been put before the Housing and Communities Committee and the Board. All housing decisions went through the Housing and Communities Committee and the Mayor was not a member of that committee.

Councillor Van de Weyer commented that he did not accept that a letter from a minister to a mayor constituted private correspondence, so there was no basis on which to withhold it. The Mayor had stated that all of the relevant information had been made available, but there was no way of knowing this to be the case without seeing the second letter from Luke Hall MP.

Councillor Boden, Lead Member for Housing and Chair of the Housing and Communities Committee, commented that he objected to the repeated claim that £45M

had been lost from the Affordable Housing Programme when the same sum was available from Government under revised terms.

Summing up, Councillor Herbert noted that discussions were taking place with officials regarding the release of Luke Hall MP's second letter to the Mayor, which he believed to be a business letter. The Combined Authority had collectively signed up to the £100M Affordable Housing Programme, but it had been changed by the Mayor in 2018. As a Mayoral Combined Authority Councillor Herbert stated his wish for members to work together.

On being proposed by Councillor Herbert, seconded by Councillor Van de Weyer, the motion was lost.

The meeting was adjourned from 12.15 to 12.30pm.

## 660. CAM Progress Report March 2021

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

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

The CAM Lead Officer reported a productive few months since the last report to the Board. Three innovative CAM design proposals had been submitted and videos were available to view on the [CAM website](#). The intention was to present the OneCAM Ltd business plan, delivery strategy and funding and finance strategies to the Combined Authority Board in June 2021. The business case funding and finance evaluation of tenders was complete, and the Board was invited to delegate authority to the chief executives to award a framework agreement to the successful tenderers. The identity of the companies would remain commercially confidential until 12 April 2021.

With the approval of the Board, the programme had been set up with the Combined Authority as programme sponsor and One CAM Ltd as the delivery body. The Board's approval was now sought to make three appointments to One CAM Ltd: the chief executive, whose identity was currently exempt from publication due to commercial confidentiality; Timothy Keogh as chief finance officer and Dr Joanna Dally as Director of Strategy and Sponsorship.

Councillor Count asked for more information about Lot 2 (Engineering, Technology and Environment) and how it related to the three CAM concept designs. Officers stated that a normal procurement process would have been carried out without the concept designs. In this case, the design concepts competition has asked three companies to do a fairly short piece of work that could feed into the work the Lot 2 consultant would do to identify the best value for money, most sustainable option. This product would

form the basis of the technical elements of the business case that would be written by the Lot 3 consultant. Councillor Count further asked for an assurance that Leaders would be consulted either informally or formally before the Lot 2 consultant began work. Ms Sawyer, Chief Executive, stated that a dedicated session or sessions around CAM concept design would be built into the Leaders' strategy programme. The CAM Lead Officer would also start developing the Combined Authority's role as programme sponsor.

Councillor Van de Weyer commented that he would like to see as much information published as possible. At present, the only publicly available information on the three concept designs were the presentations on the CAM website. He commented that there were few references to tunnels and that he would like to know what the specification was and to see a comparison of tunnelled and non-tunnelled options if this had been done. Councillor Van de Weyer commented that the technology needed for autonomous vehicles was not yet available and asked when the outline business case and information on the funding strategy would be provided and why there was no clear timeline. He further asked where information on the regional arms had come from and the relationship with garden villages. South Cambridgeshire District Council was concerned that decisions around the CAM and CAM routes related to other agreements which had already been made. Officers stated that all three concept designs covered both surface and sub-surface options. As autonomous vehicles were not yet an option all three concepts included transitional arrangements permissible by the regulatory authorities. The Combined Authority had the option of taking forward any or all of the ideas contained within the three concept designs which the Lot 2 consultant would draw together. The delivery strategy would bring together all of the previous work on business cases done by the Combined Authority. The programme business case would be a higher level business case that it was intended to produce with the engineered design by spring 2022. From that, a series of outline business cases would be developed for different components of the CAM portfolio. The funding strategy would define how the programme would be funded and financed. It was important to recognise that the design concept competition was not the same as the design of the transport system that would emerge with the business case. There would be a process to examine what was practical, achievable and safe and the business case would speak to this design. The route map was not yet defined.

The Mayor stated that garden villages had been part of the CAM from the beginning and that he had been open about this. There had only been initial discussions around land value capture, but there was nothing new about his view that garden villages were the right way to build.

Councillor Herbert commented that it appeared that the outline business case would not now be produced until 2022 and that it did not look like there would be a CAM before 2030. He asked how much had been spent each year on the CAM Metro since 2017 and how much was funded in the next year. He asked that this should include a breakdown of spend to date and projected spend next year. Councillor Herbert further asked how the governance arrangements would work. Ms Sawyer stated that the breakdown of funding would be provided outside of the meeting. With regards to governance, officers stated that the operating model for OneCAM Ltd was the one recommended by the Treasury for major programmes. The Combined Authority would be the sponsor body and Ms Sawyer would be the sponsor lead. One CAM Ltd was the

delivery body and would have a board headed by Lord Mair and a small executive team lead by its chief executive. There was a clear understanding of Ms Sawyer's role as sponsor lead and the CAM Lead Officer's role, which would be taken over by the chief executive of OneCAM Ltd on their appointment, as the delivery body lead. The sponsor body would monitor the performance of the delivery body. The Chief Finance Officer and Director of Strategy and Sponsorship for One CAM Ltd would formulate the funding and finance a package and develop the business case and would manage the Lot 3 consultant. The CAM Lead Officer stated that One CAM Ltd was the slimmest delivery authority which he had come across at this stage in a project of this scale.

Councillor Bailey commented that there was no doubt that the salaries for the three proposed senior officer appointments at OneCAM Ltd were significant, but it was important to attract individuals with the skills needed to establish a credible delivery body. Officers had done significant research into this and taken external advice and the proposed salaries reflected market rates. She welcomed the calibre of the applicants which the CAM project had attracted.

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

- a) Note the outcome of the conceptual design process with the three expert companies developing future public transport designs: Dromos Technologies, Egis Rail UK and Mott MacDonald.
- b) Delegate authority to the Chief Executives to:
  - i. award a framework agreement to the successful tenderers for Lot 2 (Engineering, Technology and Environment) and Lot 3 (Funding & Finance Advisors and Business Case Writing) following the completion of the procurement exercise and authorise the drawdown of budget for Lots 2 and 3 of up to £3.5 million.
  - ii. to approve the call-off of the required task orders under these framework agreements in accordance with the confirmed budget and agreed scope of works/ programme timescales.
  - iii. novate the Framework agreements and Task Orders to One CAM Ltd at the appropriate time.
- c) Approve the appointments of:
  - i. A Chief Executive Officer for One CAM Ltd.
  - ii. Timothy Keogh as Chief Finance Officer for One CAM Ltd.
  - iii. Dr Joanna Dally as Director of Strategy and Sponsorship for One CAM Ltd.

- d) To approve the equity investment of £2m currently earmarked in the Medium Term Financial Plan to support the running costs of One CAM Ltd during the 2021/22 financial year.

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

On a point of order, Councillor Boden commented that the vote in favour did not in his view include the required two thirds of constituent councils. If so, he suggested that consideration be given to suspending standing orders to allow the vote to be taken again if this was permissible. The Monitoring Officer stated that Huntingdonshire District Council was not represented at the meeting so the vote in favour had included two thirds of the constituent councils whose representatives were present and voting. Having left the meeting briefly to look again at the legislation founding the Combined Authority he confirmed his advice that that constituent council members needed to be present and voting to be included in the voting calculation. On that basis he confirmed that the proposals in the report had been approved. However, the Constitution was not clear on this point and this would be considered as part of its next review.

#### 661. Change to the Order of Business

With the consent of the meeting, the Mayor varied the order of business from the published agenda to take those reports with special voting arrangements next as some members needed to leave the meeting at 2.00pm.

#### 662. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Regional Transport Model

The Board was invited to approve the drawdown of £750,000 from the Medium Term Financial Plan for the development of a Regional Transport Model for the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough region. This would replace the current Cambridge Sub Regional Model (CSRM) maintained by Cambridgeshire County Council and the Peterborough Sub Regional Model. The intention was to produce a multi-modal model with key stakeholders and partners to develop and maintain the next iteration of a regional model and the funding would be used to purchase business-critical software.

Councillor Count supported the proposal, commenting that good modelling led to good decision-making.

Councillor Herbert asked for information about the data being collected and timescales. Officers stated that meetings were already taking place with the Department of Transport regarding the collection of data and expectations around procurement.

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

Approve the drawdown of £750,000 from the Medium Term Financial Plan for the development of a Regional Transport Model for the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough region.

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

### 663. A605 Stanground – Whittlesey Access Improvement

The Board received an update on the progress of the A605 Stanground to Whittlesey improvements and a request to approve additional capital funding of £220,000 to support the project. The main construction work was underway, but the close proximity of a high pressure gas main meant that there was a projected overspend on cost. The Combined Authority was being recommended to fund this with Peterborough City Council funding contingency costs.

Councillor Holdich expressed his regret at the overspend and commented that the high pressure gas main had only been discovered when work commenced.

Councillor Boden commented that it was clear that the junction required improvement, so he was content to support the proposal as the least bad option. He noted that there was on-going work at Kings Dyke and that it would be important to co-ordinate the two sets of works to minimise disruption.

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

Approve additional funding of £220,000 for the A605 Stanground – Whittlesey Access Improvement.

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

### 664. Local Transport Plan and Low Emission Vehicles Strategy

The Board received a report which sought the approval and allocation of £200,000 from the Medium Term Financial Plan revenue budget to carry out a refresh of the Local Transport Plan (LTP) during the 2021/22 financial year and to produce an alternative fuel vehicle strategy. There had been a number of significant changes since the Local Transport Plan (LTP) was published last in January 2020, including a revised national bus strategy, national walking and cycling policy and a focus on environmental issues. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Commission on Climate had also published its initial recommendations which would need to be taken into account and there had been a significant impact on transport due to the Covid pandemic. The alternative fuel vehicle strategy had a zero-carbon ambition and it would be timely to develop this alongside the LTP refresh. The proposals were considered at the

Transport and Infrastructure Committee meeting on 10 March 2021 where it was agreed by a majority to recommend the proposals to the Combined Authority Board for approval.

Councillor Herbert asked about links with the OxCam Arc given that had a statutory spatial plan and whether this would be an annual exercise with a further £200k needed in the 2022/23 financial year. He expressed the view that judgements could not be made at present due to the possibly significant changes to transport use arising from the pandemic. Officers acknowledged the uncertainty arising from Covid and stated that a number of scenarios would be explored as understanding of the impact of the pandemic developed. In relation to the OxCam Arc, the Combined Authority was supportive of East West Rail and needed to understand how as the Local Transport Authority to maximise the opportunities presented. There was currently £200k in the budget for the 2021/22 financial year to progress this work and a further £100k in the budget for the 2022/23 financial year, subject to approval.

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

Approve and allocate £200,000 from the Medium Term Financial Plan revenue budget for Local Transport Plan development work, in line with the proposals in the report to the Transport and Infrastructure Committee on 10 March 2021.

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

## 665. Fengate Phase 2 University Access

The Board's approval was sought to the drawdown of £160,000 from the Medium-Term Financial Plan to produce Phase One of the Outline Business Case for the Fengate Phase 2 University Access project and to carry forward £120,000 of subject to approval funding into 2021-22 financial year. The Embankment had been identified as an opportunity growth area by Peterborough City Council. Two packages of measures had been identified and modelling of both packages was needed to identify the preferred option. These proposals were considered at the Transport and Infrastructure Committee meeting on 10 March 2021 where it was agreed by a majority to recommend the proposals to the Combined Authority Board for approval.

Councillor Holdich stated that he fully supported the proposals. Councillor Herbert stated that he would be supporting the proposal as it was not possible to create the new university without roads to support it.

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

- a) Approve the drawdown of £160,000 from the Medium-Term Financial Plan to produce Phase One of the Outline Business Case and to carry forward £120,000 of subject to approval funding into 2021-22 financial year.

- b) Authorise the Director of Delivery and Strategy to conclude a Grant Funding Agreement with Peterborough City Council on terms approved by the Chief Legal Officer.

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

## 666. A47 Dualling

The Board received an update on the outcome of discussions with Highways England on the A47 Dualling project. The Mayor had met with Baroness Vere, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State at the Department for Transport, in January 2021 to discuss the A47 as part of the Combined Authority's continuing efforts to secure Government agreement that this project would be taken forward in partnership with Highways England and recognised as a priority for development work. It was confirmed at that meeting that Highways England would undertake a strategic assessment of the A47 between the A16 and Walton Highway to the east of Waterbeach, working in partnership with the Combined Authority. Highways England has since confirmed that it would fund the work, showing a significant commitment to the development of the project. A Highways England project manager had been appointed and work began in February 2020. Engagement with Highways England will continue through monthly project boards. The report was considered at the Transport and Infrastructure Committee meeting on 10 March 2021 where its content was noted.

Councillor Holdich stated that this work was important to the local economy and that it had his support. Councillor Count agreed, describing the project as vital. However, he was uncomfortable without a written commitment to the project from Government and would want to see this obtained.

Councillor Herbert commented that the A47 was a vital piece of transport infrastructure and he that he would like to see how the schemes joined up.

On being proposed by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Holdich, it was resolved unanimously to note the content of the report to the Transport and Infrastructure Committee on 10 March 2021.

## 667. Wisbech Rail

The Board was invited to approve the drawdown of £300,000 capital funding from the Medium-Term Financial Plan to enable the next steps in the project to progress in 2021/22. Successful engagement with the Department for Transport Office of Rail and Road and Network Rail about the business case and GRIP 3 study for Wisbech Rail had identified a number of opportunities, including a review of the level crossing strategy to include barrier crossings and to consider the re-use of materials from other Network Rail projects. Discussions also explored how best to ensure the link between



Wisbech Rail and the Ely area capacity enhancements which were needed to achieve a two trains per hour direct service to Cambridge. The Mayor had met the Minister of State for Transport on two occasions to discuss these projects and the Minister subsequently confirmed that the Wisbech Rail project would be considered for funding alongside the outputs from the Ely area capacity enhancements outline business case. The Combined Authority had secured Network Rail's agreement to deliver the next phase of the business case development in partnership. This work would look to align Wisbech Rail with the delivery sequence of the Ely area capacity enhancements. It would also include assessing options for the Wisbech to March rail line, including an initial service between Wisbech and March with a view to direct services to Cambridge subject to improvements in capacity being achieved at Ely North junction. These proposals were considered at the Transport and Infrastructure Committee meeting on 10 March 2021 where it was unanimously to recommend the proposal to the Combined Authority Board for approval.

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

Approve the drawdown of £300,000 capital funding from the Medium-Term Financial Plan to enable the next steps to progress and be spent in 2021/22.

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

The Mayor offered his thanks to Steve Barclay MP for his help in keeping the project on track.

## 668. St Ives

The Board was invited to approve the reallocation of revenue budget savings of £137,000 made through the efficient tendering of the A141 strategic outline business case (SOBC) to fund the SOBC associated with St Ives. This left additional capital funding available for other projects in St. Ives. This proposal was considered at the Transport and Infrastructure Committee meeting on 10 March 2021 where it was agreed unanimously to recommend the proposals to the Combined Authority Board for approval.

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

Approve the reallocation of revenue budget savings of £137,000, made through the efficient tendering of the A141 Strategic Outline Business Case project, to fund the Strategic Outline Business Case associated with St Ives.

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

The Mayor stated that there were significant studies relating to Huntingdonshire which indicated that this was the right thing to do.

#### 669. March Area Transport Study: March 2021

The Board received a report which sought approval for the drawdown of £60,000 from the Medium-Term Financial Plan to undertake additional work to establish a list of walking and cycling interventions. Officers reported good collaboration on the proposal with Fenland District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council. The proposal was considered at the Transport and Infrastructure Committee meeting on 10 March 2021 where it was agreed unanimously to recommend the proposals to the Combined Authority Board for approval.

Councillor Count commented that he lived in March and was happy to support the proposals. He commended the work of Councillor Jan French in chairing the project. With regard to the northern link road, his preference would be to see this lined up straight away with walking and cycling options alongside.

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

Approve the drawdown of £60,000 from the Medium-Term Financial Plan to undertake additional work to establish a list of walking and cycling interventions

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

#### 670. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2.02pm on Wednesday 24 March 2021 as some Members needed to leave. It was reconvened at 8.00am on Friday 26 March and there were no changes to attendance. With the consent of the meeting, the order of business was varied from the published agenda to consider reports requiring decisions first.

#### 671. Budget Monitor Report: March 2021

The report provided an update on the 2020/21 budget position and capital programme as at 31 January 2021 and asked the Board to approve the provisional carry forward of budgets based on the forecast outturn position. This would allow projects without allocated budgets for the 2021/22 financial year to continue to operate. The total forecast revenue underspend was around £7M and officers were seeking approval to carry forward around £5.7M. This related mainly to multi-year programmes such as the Adult Education Budget (AEB) and the CAM. A report would be brought to a future meeting setting out the final year-end position.

There had been some capital programme slippage and the appendices to the report showed the split between slippage and underspends. It was noted that slippage of up

to 30% on large capital projects was not unusual. The Board's attention was drawn to an error in Appendix 2 whereby the digital connectivity budget line should have been shown as slippage rather than an underspend.

The report also recorded the Chief Finance Officer's acceptance of four grants and approval of associated spend for the two revenue grants via officer decision notice and included a summary of the audit of the 2019/20 Financial Accounts which had been given an unqualified opinion by the external auditors.

Councillor Van de Weyer asked about outputs for the £600k spend on garden villages. Officers stated that this related to on-going work on the garden villages programme in relation to the CAM. Much of the expenditure would have been on legal advice and planning applications. Going forward, there might also be potential land purchases. Ms Sawyer, Chief Executive, stated that there had been discussions with Leaders during the past year on how the CAM programme would be taken forward. Consequent to that, officers had begun looking at garden villages and had been working with Deloitte and Homes England to produce a strategy. The emerging findings of that work were that the garden villages strategy and the OneCAM network were intrinsically linked. This was currently being worked up into a single strategy and would be taken to a future informal Leaders' session to test the concept. If approved, it would be brought formally to the Board in June 2021. Ms Sawyer stated that there had been no land acquisitions to date and that the spend had been related to testing the concept around land value capture.

Councillor Herbert commented that it was not yet year-end and that a lot of sensible carry-forwards were done after the year-end rather than at this stage. He noted that the proposed carry forward of £2.7M on Health and Care Academies represented over 80% of the budget and that the Bus Review had a budget of £1.8M, but had spent less than 10% of this amount which he assumed indicated it would be delayed by a year. Councillor Herbert further asked how much had been spent to date on the CAM and how much was in the budget for the next financial year. The Chief Finance Officer confirmed that carry-forwards would usually be managed after the financial year when the final figures were known. However, where no budget was allocated in the next financial year programmes would have to stop pending agreement of the carry-forward if no carry-forward had been agreed. In relation to the CAM, a breakdown of expenditure to the end of January 2021 was included in the appendices to the report. The CAM outline business case showed a total spend of £1.3M on original work plus £6.9M on the development of strategies and the second phase of work. Within the medium term financial plan there was £2M earmarked for equity investment in OneCAM Ltd and £5M for the development of a programme business case. Equity investment in the company would be used for operating costs, including salary costs. The Health and Care Academies programme had been impacted by the pandemic, but the grant was ring-fenced and would be carried forward for delivery in the next financial year.

The Mayor stated that work was continuing with Government in relation to buses as this was a national issue. New bus routes had been brought forward in response to the pandemic and £100k seed funding had been received. The issue of franchising was being actively explored and he was confident that the Combined Authority would be able to deliver a much improved bus service across the county. Councillor Herbert commented that he would be surprised if bus franchising could raise more than £3-5M

and he was concerned that expectations should not be raised unrealistically. The source of revenue funding going forward would also need to be addressed.

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

- a) Note the financial position of the Combined Authority for the year to date.
- b) Approve the provisional carry forwards as set out in the paper.
- c) Note the Chief Finance Officer's acceptance of four grants, and approval of associated spend for the two revenue grants.

## 672. Financial Strategies 2021-22

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

The Board was reminded that whilst it was responsible for the adoption of the Combined Authority's financial strategies these were also reviewed by the Audit and Governance Committee who could provide the Board with advice. The Audit and Governance Committee was also provided with regular updates during the year by officers on the capital strategy, the treasury management strategy, the investment strategy and the minimum revenue provision statement (MRP). The position was substantially the same as the previous year with the main differences being summarised in section 4 of the report. Officers had worked closely with the Combined Authority's treasury management advisers in preparing the financial strategies.

Councillor Herbert commented that the Combined Authority Board was the sovereign body and that whilst it welcomed the input of the Audit and Governance Committee the decision rested with the Board. He commented that he had found the report more difficult to read than the Chief Finance Officer's usual reports and asked for more information on the rate of return being achieved and the range. He also asked about the further sums loaned to Laragh Homes. The Chief Finance Officer stated that report was based on templates provided by the Combined Authority's treasury management advisers and the capital strategy document brought together all of the main points across all of the strategies. Rates of return were low, particularly the money market funds, but these provided liquidity to the organisation and reflected the CIPFA prudential code which bound the organisation to take account of security first, then liquidity and then yield in relation to the management of its investments. Reports to the Audit and Governance Committee were benchmarked against other local authorities and the Combined Authority's performance was considered satisfactory. The rate of return ranged from around 0.2% to around 1% and was determined by when investments were made and for how long. The Chief Finance Officer's understanding was that the Combined Authority's position was protected in the eventuality of a local authority to which it had lent money going bust and that this would be considered very low risk. Some Debt Management Office (DMO) rates in recent times had gone into negative positions, but he was not aware that the Combined Authority had experienced any losses due to this. Councillor Herbert asked if this could be confirmed and also

asked for further details outside of the meeting on both loans and rates of return over the past couple of years.

Councillor Count commented that he had previously been the Lead Member for Investment and Finance and noted the difficulty in raising revenue via treasury management investment. During the Icelandic banking collapse many local authorities had lost significant sums and this had led to stringent treasury management measures being followed. Higher rates of return were linked to higher rates of risk. With regard to the discussion around the inclusion of both clean copies of the strategies and copies containing tracked changes within the published papers, Councillor Count's recollection was that this was what had been required previously by the Board and he was comfortable that this was the right approach.

The Mayor stated that the £40M allocated to the affordable housing programme revolving fund was still within the budget and would be there to be used to deliver more £100k Homes over the course of the next four years.

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

- a) Approve the following Financial Strategies:
  - i. The Capital Strategy 2021-22
  - ii. The Investment Strategy 2021-22
  - iii. The Treasury Management Strategy 2021-22
- b) Approve the Minimum Revenue Provision Statement for 2021-22

### 673. Market Towns Programme - Approval of Fourth Tranche of Project Proposals

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

The Board was invited to approve the fourth tranche of project proposals received from Fenland District Council and East Cambridgeshire District Council under the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) Market Towns Programme Investment Prospectus. To date, 38 projects had been approved through this programme which had received over £9M in grant funding and attracted a further £11M in match investment. In addition to the proposals before the Board a proposal relating to a Chatteris community and museum space had been referred back to the applicant for further work. All of the project proposals had been assessed against an

agreed set of appraisal metrics and were required to meet a specified rating in order to be recommended to the Board for approval.

The Mayor stated that he was

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

- a) Approve project proposals received under the Market Towns Programme and in response to town centre Covid-19 recovery received from Fenland and Huntingdonshire to the sum of £778,679
- b) Authorise the Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer to complete grant agreements with the grant recipients

#### 674. Greater South East Energy Hub

The Board was invited to review arrangements for the Greater South East Energy Hub and agree that the Combined Authority should remain as Accountable Body. The Board's attention was drawn to a number of opportunities which had been identified around shortening supply chains.

Councillor Holdich commented that a previous proposal that Peterborough City Council should take over the role of Accountable Body was no longer considered suitable. Peterborough City Council supported the officer recommendation that the Combined Authority was best placed to deliver across the region now that the Hub was backed by Government funding.

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

- a) Review the transfer of the Accountable Body for the Greater South East Energy Hub
- b) Agree to retain the Accountable Body for the Greater South East Energy Hub as the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority
- c) Approve the Greater South East Energy Hub Business Plan for the Combined Authority area and, subject to the grant being offered by BEIS, approve the creation of a budget line to deliver the services set out in the Memorandum of Understanding.
- d) Delegate Authority to the Chief Officer to enter into contracts for Managing Agent(s), works or other, as required, to spend the funding for the Green Home Grant Local Authority Delivery scheme.

## 675. Independent Commission on Climate - Interim report

An addition to the recommendations contained in the report was published on 19 March 2021 and circulated electronically to members of the Board. This invited the Board to agree, without prejudice to its full response to the Commission's recommendations, to the immediate release of £50k of revenue funding to provide support to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Commission on Climate (CPICC) Fenland Peat Committee in the coming financial year and to commission officers to start preparatory work on the formation of a Climate Cabinet, as described in the Commission's interim report.

The Mayor invited Councillor Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to share the Committee's questions on this item. A copy of the questions and responses are attached at Appendix 1. Councillor Count commented that he judged it to be inappropriate that the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had offered comment on the Mayor's response to the first question and sought advice. The Monitoring Officer stated that, subject to the Mayor's discretion, the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had scope to ask a follow-up question, but not to offer comment. The Mayor commented that he felt that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had made great strides under Councillor Dupré's chairing, but that she was responsible for presenting the views of the whole of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and not her personal views.

The interim report of the CPICC set out its findings that Cambridgeshire and Peterborough were facing climate-related challenges including flood risk, water supply, over-heating and impact on farming. Emissions were higher per head than the national average and were reducing at a slower rate. However, further evidence was needed in some areas including in relation to emissions from peat soil which had led to an additional recommendation being made in relation to that issue. The Commission had highlighted that there were opportunities available in responding to climate change as well as challenges. These included growth in green tech businesses and potential job creation around retro-fits and adaptations to farming. Improvements might also be achieved in relation to well-being and bio-diversity. The Commission's evidence base showed that the area could achieve a net-zero carbon base by 2050 and continue to grow its economy strongly. The Commission would be carrying out more work on the financial aspects of a transition to a greener position and how best to ensure that no areas or communities were disadvantaged. The Combined Authority was already engaged in significant activity that aligned with the Commission's interim recommendations including the low vehicle emission strategy discussed previously in the meeting (minute 664 refers) and the roll-out of broadband and public wifi. The Commission's recommendations sought a response from beyond the Combined Authority and other local authorities, including a wider sector response and more devolved funding by Government to enable tailored local solutions.

The Monitoring Officer confirmed that an amendment submitted during the meeting by Councillor Van de Weyer was in order, subject to it including the additional report recommendation that had been added after publication (copy attached at Appendix 2).

Councillor Van de Weyer welcomed the Commission's work and the interim report. His main concern was how the recommendations would be taken forward. Given the

urgency of the situation and the scale of what was needed he proposed that the Board should accept the Commission's recommendations in principle now, pending an assessment of their implementation which would be carried out with the engagement of member councils and the Business Board.

In seconding the amendment, Councillor Herbert welcomed the work done by Baroness Brown. In his judgement, the Commission's recommendations should be treated with the same seriousness which the Board had accorded to the recommendations of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review (CPIER) report. The recommendations contained significant challenges, but they were also skilfully worded and as such he was comfortable to proceed. He welcomed the proposals on peat and judged that there was a need to be clear about what the Combined Authority was going to take on as additionality at the earliest stage as some matters would be for the county and district councils.

Councillor Boden commented that the interim report contained dozens of recommendations, many of which would have far-reaching consequences. As such he deemed it inappropriate to accept them all in principle without debate. Instead, he believed that the Combined Authority should develop a considered response on an item by item basis.

Councillor Holdich described the amendment as incoherent. In his view, the recommendations required a considered response. Significant investment would be required if they were adopted and the Combined Authority needed to work with the county and district councils in considering its response.

Mr Adams commented that he fully supported the report, but was unable to support the amendment. Bringing the business community on board would be an important element in making change happen. Some of the recommendations offered opportunities to business, but some could be potentially debilitating and it was important that business was involved to ensure buy in.

Councillor Bailey commented that much of what could be achieved was dependent on winning hearts and minds. She accepted the spirit of the recommendations, but the recommendations contained very detailed proposals and a lot more work needed to be done first to understand how they could be delivered.

Councillor Count described the Commission's interim report as excellent. He judged that it should be given the respect it deserved and be considered in detail in conjunction with partners before a response was made.

Summing up, Councillor Van de Weyer commented that the Commission's interim recommendations had been carefully formulated to be achievable. In his view, any issues identified as the report was considered should be dealt with on a case by case basis as they arose and that should not undermine the Board's acceptance of the report as a whole. He judged that this issue was too urgent to be addressed in the same way as a normal council decision and that the Board needed to start acting now.

On being put to the vote the amendment was defeated. Councillor Count left the meeting.



The Monitoring Officer confirmed that a further amendment submitted during the meeting by Councillor Boden was in order (copy attached at Appendix 3). Councillor Boden proposed that in recognition of the non-executive role of the proposed climate cabinet references to 'a climate cabinet' should be changed to read 'climate working group'. The Monitoring Officer confirmed that the amendment was in order. However, as the Combined Authority had a Board rather than a cabinet model the reference to a cabinet in this context was not a technical description.

Councillor Herbert commented that he felt that the amendment was contrary to the spirit of the reservations expressed by some members of the Board in relation to the previous amendment. The role of the Board was clearly sovereign and as such he saw no need to make such a change.

Councillor Van de Weyer commented that the term working group did not in his view reflect the importance of the body proposed.

On being proposed by Councillor Boden, seconded by Councillor Holdich the amendment was approved by a majority of those present and voting.

The Mayor opened the substantive recommendations to debate. Councillor Herbert commented that in his view a lot of different bodies would be needed to deliver the proposed recommendations, not just the Combined Authority. The role of the mayor would be to take this work on, recognising that it was a partnership. He questioned the statement by officers that zero carbon could be achieved by 2050 as this was not a certainty and would be dependent on the support of various other organisations and central Government in addition to the Combined Authority.

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

- a) welcome the initial report of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Commission on Climate (CPICC) and formally thank the Chair and members of the Commission for their work so far;
- b) develop a response to the Commission recommendations, with the engagement of member councils and the Business Board, to consider at an early future meeting of the Board.
- c) without prejudice to that full response, to:
  - i. immediately release £50,000 of revenue funding to provide support to the CPICC Fenland Peat Committee in the coming financial year; and
  - ii. Commission officers to commence preparatory work for the formation of the Climate Cabinet (as described in the CPICC report), as part of Overarching Recommendation 1, although in recognition of the non-executive role of the body, references to a 'climate cabinet' should be changed to 'climate working group'.

The Mayor thanked Baroness Brown, the Chair of the CPICC, and the Commission for an exceptional piece of work. In establishing the Commission, the Combined Authority wanted a clear document setting out the best practice to deliver climate change solutions for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough which all parties could work to. He thanked Baroness Brown for highlighting the issue of peat and the impact of this on the agricultural communities and agricultural economy in Fenland. As a result of the Commission's work it had become evident that there was a lack of data on this issue nationally and the farming community would be match-funding the £50k which the Board had now agreed to release to provide support to the CPICC Fenland Peat Committee in the coming financial year to look at the best options for peat preservation and locking in carbon.

## 676. Lifetime Skills Guarantee

The Board was invited to approve the proposed commissioning approach for the additional funding received by the Combined Authority to deliver a new Level 3 adult education offer in the region. The additional funding allocation from the Department for Education for the period 1 April 2021 to 31 July 2021 would be £207,838 with a further £833,623 for the period 1 August 2021 to 31 July 2022. In addition, there would be a £4,423 uplift to the funding rate for 19–23-year-olds for the period 1 April 2021 to 31 July 2021, equating to additional funding of £1,045,844 across the region. Improved skills and qualifications were linked to improved job and salary prospects, but at present the level of Level 3 qualifications in Peterborough and Fenland were below the national average. This would require significant capacity building and the promotion of Level 3 training in those areas. Officers were working with partners and providers on an additional offer tailored to the needs of those areas in addition to the DfE proposals. The recommendations were considered by the Skills Committee on 15 March 2021 where it was agreed unanimously to recommend the proposals to the Combined Authority Board for approval.

Councillor Herbert noted with regret the closure of the John Lewis branch in Peterborough and the impact that this would have. He welcomed the additional funding allocation, but asked why this was targeted at those aged 24+. The Director of Business and Skills stated that targeting the money to those aged 24+ was a DfE stipulation, but that representations were being made on this via the Mayor and the Local Government Association. The Local Economic Recovery Strategy (LERS) set out existing interventions on skills brokerage with a focus on those areas and people in particular need. An application would also be made for community renewal funding in June 2021 which, if successful, would also support displaced workers.

Councillor Holdich, Lead Member for Skills and Chair of the Skills Committee, reminded the Board that the recommendations had been endorsed unanimously by the Skills Committee. The John Lewis Partnership had made £1M available across the stores which were being closed to support staff re-training and he expressed the hope that the Combined Authority would be able to draw on this resource.

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

- a) Note the additional funding from the Department for Education (DfE), delegated to Mayoral Combined Authorities as part of the Government's Lifetime Skills Guarantee, to deliver free Level 3 courses for adults aged 24+.
- b) Approve the approach to spending this additional ring-fenced funding through the Adult Education Board (AEB) Commissioning Principles set out in the report to the Skills Committee on 15 March 2021, including the creation of a 'Level 3 courses' budget line as shown in Table 2, and applying a 3.4% top slice.

The Mayor expressed his thanks to Councillor Holdich for his skilful chairing of the Skills Committee and for focusing on those in most need of upskilling.

## 677. Local Economic Recovery Strategy Updated Refresh

The Board received a third iteration of the Local Economic Recovery Strategy (LERS) which had been further updated to reflect new and emerging impacts of Covid-19. This version benefitted from more data via Metrodynamics on the impact of the pandemic on the local economy and from input from local authority partners and stakeholders. The Strategy offered opportunities to grow back in greener and more sustainable ways which would accord with the interim recommendations of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Commission on Climate (CPICC). Existing interventions around skills brokerage had been adapted, but unfortunately there would still not be enough jobs for all displaced workers during the next six months. To help address this deficit there would be support available to single person start-ups. The refreshed LERS was considered at the Business Board meeting on 16 March 2021 where it was agreed unanimously to recommend the refreshed LERS to the Combined Authority Board for approval.

Mr Adams endorsed the work which was being done to support economic recovery and those workers who had been displaced due to the pandemic.

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

- Approve the updated version of the Local Economic Recovery Strategy (LERS) for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

## 678. Resolution of Local Enterprise Partnership Overlaps

The Board was invited to note and approve the revised geographical local enterprise partnership (LEP) boundary and to approve the final two Strategic Partnership Agreements (SPAs) between the Business Board and its neighbouring LEPs. Arrangements had also been put in place for a peer review. The agreement with the Hertfordshire and Lincolnshire LEPs was simpler than those produced previously for the other neighbouring LEPs, but Government was comfortable with this approach and had produced the revised geographical boundary map based on the this. These proposals

were considered by the Business Board on 16 March 2021 where they were recommended unanimously to the Combined Authority Board for approval.

Mr Adams commented that this had been brought before the Board on several occasions as agreements were reached with various neighbouring LEPs. In order to prioritise Covid recovery measures this work had taken longer than would otherwise have been the case, but it was now complete.

Councillor Herbert asked what this would mean in terms of money, noting the Board's role in addressing pockets of disadvantage wherever these existed with the Combined Authority area. The Director of Business and Skills stated that LEPs were no longer allocated funding. Instead, Government policy was focused on the levelling-up agenda. The Combined Authority contained a Level 1 area (Peterborough) and a Level 2 area (Fenland) and so it would potentially have access to more funding.

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

- a) Note and approve the revised geographical local enterprise partnership (LEP) boundary and resolution of delivery overlaps with neighbouring LEPs.
- b) Approve the Strategic Partnership Agreements (SPAs) with the remaining two neighbouring LEPs.

## 679. Business Growth Service

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

The Board was invited to approve in principle an increase in the maximum grant limit from £150,000 to £500,000 on the Business Growth Service Capital Grant scheme for the application described in the exempt appendix to the report. The project demonstrated high growth and employment potential in Peterborough, but it would be subject to detailed scrutiny and to the investment case being approved by the Business Board.

The Board was also advised of an urgent decision taken via Mayoral Decision Notice on the advice of the Business Board to waive the pre-condition relating to European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) inward investment into the Business Growth Service. This was to allow the service to continue.

Mr Adams commented that there had been significant debate at the Business Board and the recommendations had been amended to seek the Board's agreement in principle to the raising of the maximum grant limit, subject to the Business Board

subjecting the project proposals to a much higher level of scrutiny. Mr Adams described this as an example of confidentiality being key to the Business Board's work.

Councillor Bailey commented that the exempt appendix to the report described an exciting opportunity and she thanked the Business Board for the detailed consideration the project proposal was receiving and for its careful management of public funds.

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

- a) Approve in principle raising the maximum grant limit from £150,000 to £500,000 on the Business Growth Service Capital Grant scheme, for the applicant as set out in the exempt Appendix 4, subject to the investment case of that company being approved by the Business Board;
- b) Note the Business Board Urgency Procedure Decision.
- c) Note the Mayoral Decision Notice.
- d) Note the Business Growth Service contractual and financial position (Mayor)

## 680. Combined Authority Mayoral Elections 2021

The Board was advised that the estimated costs of administering the 2021 Combined Authority Mayoral elections currently stood at £1.1M compared to a budget allocation of £1.04M. The increase in costs was largely due to the need to put in place Covid-safe arrangements and officers were seeking to access the Government funding promised to local authorities for Covid-related costs.

Councillor Herbert asked whether the fact that other elections were taking place at the same time would reduce the Combined Authority's costs. He further asked about the arrangements for the Mayoral election count. Mr Hill, Chief Executive, stated that under normal circumstances there would be an expectation of economies of scale reducing the costs to each constituent authority. However, due to Covid, the estimated costs were slightly above what would otherwise have been expected at this stage. The cost of administering the Mayoral, county council and police and crime commissioner elections were shared on a negotiated basis that had been agreed by each organisation's chief finance officers and returning officers. Each authority would be responsible for counting its own votes. The count for the Mayoral election would take place at the Ross Peers Sports Centre in Soham as that would be the location of the Combined Authority Returning Officer and he believed the count would begin at 10.00am with a declaration expected around midday.

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

Note the Combined Authority noted the cost estimates for the 2021 Mayoral Elections.

Councillor Herbert left the meeting.

## 681. England's Economic Heartland Transport Strategy

The Board was invited to provide feedback to the Mayor as the Combined Authority's representative on England's Economic Heartland (EEH) on their views on the EEH revised Transport Strategy. If the revised Strategy was approved by the Secretary of State government officials would be required to take account of it in future planning. There were two areas where the current draft did not align with the Combined Authority's previous response. These were the proposal to give EEH formal status and bringing forward the 2050 target for net zero carbon emissions without the provision of a costed analysis. The proposals were considered at the Transport and Infrastructure Committee meeting on 10 March 2021 where the Committee agreed unanimously to recommend the proposals to the Combined Authority Board for comment.

The Mayor stated that he had asked for this to be brought back to the Board as there had been a few issues to consider, but he was now comfortable with the position.

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

Provide advice to the Mayor on the Combined Authority's position in relation to the revised Transport Strategy prepared by England's Economic Heartland (EEH), for him to take into account in attending EEH governance meetings.

## 682. Local Growth Fund Programme Management Review January 2021

The Board was invited to note the programme updates set out in the report to the Business Board on 16 March 2021. At present there were eight programmes which would still have a balance at 31 March 2021. Approval had been given to a capital swap to confirm that all project funding had been completed by the 31 March 2021 deadline. Only one Covid capital grant scheme project would run beyond 31 March 2021 with a budget of £7.3k. There were 27 candidates for the Business Growth Service capital grant and these were currently being reviewed. All except one payment within the Eastern Agri-Tech Growth Initiative would be made by 31 March 2021 and the remaining payment of around £30k would be made in April. 2183 jobs had been created via the Growth Hub. The report was considered at the Business Board meeting on 16 March 2021 where it was agreed unanimously to recommend the programme updates contained in the report to the Combined Authority Board for noting.

Mr Adams congratulated officers on their excellent work in managing the allocation of the available funding to appropriate projects within the required timescale in spite of the additional demands created by the Covid response.

Councillor Holdich highlighted the positive impact of the Mayor and the Combined Authority on Peterborough in during the past four years. This included delivering the University of Peterborough, directing over £40M of schemes into Peterborough and delivering some good affordable housing schemes. As he prepared to retire he offered his thanks to the Mayor, Board members and officers for their support.

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

Note the programme updates set out in the report to the Business Board on 16 March 2021.

On behalf of the Board, the Mayor offered his best wishes to Councillor Holdich as he stepped down as a councillor after over 40 years of service. He further expressed his thanks to the Board and to officers for their support during the past four years since his election as Mayor. It had been an exceptionally long meeting, but he judged that the investment into the local economy and the quality of the opportunities which had been considered justified the investment of members' time.

(Mayor)

## Questions from O&S to the CPCA Board 24 March 2021

### Item 2.2 Financial Strategies 2021/22

- 1) What plans does the Combined Authority have to move towards decarbonising its investments?

*A: The Board is being asked to consider its response to the recommendations of the Climate Change Commission in a later item on this agenda. Officers will consider how the Board's responses to those recommendations may inform future investment decision making. Officers will then take advice from our treasury advisors on how best to meet the Board's recommendations in the drafting of future financial strategies.*

- 2) What can be done to adopt for the purposes of existing projects the Climate Commission's recommendation that climate assessments should be undertaken for Combined Authority projects, and what financial impact would this have?

*A: The Board is being invited at this meeting to agree to bring forward a costed detailed action plan to implement the Climate Change Commission's recommendations. The recommendation on climate assessments will be addressed and costed as part of that exercise. The direct financial impact of climate assessments would probably be negligible. Its indirect financial effect would be to ensure that all projects' budgets reflected appropriate measures to meet the 2050 net zero target.*

### 3.1 CAM Progress Report March 2021

- 3) Please will the Combined Authority provide comparative data for Chief Executive and other senior officer remuneration packages for other projects similar to CAM?

*A: During the initial stages of the search for the CEO of One Cam a number of suitable candidates from a wide range of similar organisation were considered for long listing. These organisations included Thames Tideway, Crossrail, HS2 and TFL. The average salary expectations of those on the long list was £255,000 per annum plus an average bonus of 30%. The short list was selected based on experience and capability to deliver the project and their average salary expectation was £288,000 plus an average bonus of 45%. A number of other candidates working inside and outside of the UK were also initially considered, but salary expectations significantly exceeded our budget.*

- 4) In regard to the performance related pay could the criteria that will be used to assess the CEO and other senior staff be provided to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee?



*A: The performance of the CEO and other senior staff will be assessed by the One CAM Board in relation to the achievement of One CAM Limited annual objectives which will be set out in the Business Plan. The Business Plan is a requirement of the Shareholder Agreement and is being developed now; it will be submitted to the Combined Authority Board in June. The senior staff performance assessment process and annual outcome will be made available to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.*

- 5) Can the Combined Authority provide the Overview & Scrutiny Committee with confirmation of funding currently in place for CAM, and the security of the funding for entire project?

*A: The Overview and Scrutiny Committee will be aware that the Board approved the Medium-Term Financial Plan at its January meeting. The plan earmarked capital funding of £2m to support the activities of One CAM limited in 2021/22, and a further £5m in 2021/22, £6.5m in 2022/23 and £6.5m in 2023/24 to support the development of the CAM Business Case. These earmarked allocations being 'subject to approval' by the Combined Authority Board. The Funding and Financing Delivery Strategy for the CAM is currently being drafted which will appraise the options for securing the necessary funding going forward.*

### 3.6 Independent Commission on Climate Change: Interim Report

- 6) At a meeting of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee on 28 October 2019, the Mayor declined to declare a climate emergency when invited by the Committee to do so. Has the interim report of the Climate Commission affected his view on this?

*A: On the contrary, the interim report provides practical and definite recommendations about how to meet the 2050 net zero target which the Board will now be taking forward. This is a great deal better than declaring an emergency without having a plan. Deliverable measures are infinitely more useful than rhetoric.*

- 7) The Climate Commission report recommends that a Climate Cabinet is set up. How open and transparent will this Climate Cabinet be? Will it meet in public? Will members of the public and of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee have access to its papers? How does the Combined Authority Board intend to prioritise the recommendations in the report?

*A: The Board is being invited to agree that the steps needed to set up a Climate Cabinet will be taken and that officers will bring forward a detailed proposal. That proposal will cover the issues in the first three questions. The Board is also being invited at this meeting to agree to bring forward a costed detailed action plan to implement the Climate Change Commission's recommendations. That plan will address the fourth question, about prioritisation.*

- 8) How will the Climate Commission and the Combined Authority Board engage with key stakeholders especially the farming community to ensure there is good communication around the issue of peat outlined within the Commission's report?

*A: It is vital that policy on peatlands is made on the basis of a much stronger evidence base than is available to policymakers at the moment. There are very significant gaps in the data on peat, and very significant gaps in understanding of the effects of different farming methods. Fen farmers and other members of the Fen community must be given the lead role in developing a robust evidence base before government decisions are made. The Board is being invited at this meeting to accept the Commission's recommendation to establish a Fenland Peat Committee. That group will engage with key stakeholders and especially the farming community to ensure their voices are heard and their evidence taken on board by government as it develops policy about peatlands.*

#### 5.1 £100M Affordable Housing Programme

- 9) The Combined Authority agreement and the business case indicates that the authority was to seek funding to supplement the funding received from government for the £100m Affordable Housing programme. What steps have been taken by the Combined Authority in accordance with this requirement? Could a list of these be provided with dates and the outcome and the levels of funding secured?

*A: The Combined Authority supported the successful £219m Housing Infrastructure Fund investment – a HIF - for the Cambridge North East Fringe scheme. It also supported an initial HIF application for the Wisbech garden village project, which has positioned the project for an application for a future round of HIF, if and when the Government releases a further funding round. We have also raised the profile of the 500 unit scheme at Kennett with Government, to position that for any available future housing funding support.*

- 10) The recommendations refer to the 'completion' of the £100m Affordable Housing Programme. Does the Board believe that the programme will be 'completed', ie with £100m received and 2,000 homes delivered by March 2022?

*A: We cannot predict what will happen in the next 12 months. Clearly, we will endeavour to deliver the maximum number of units possible. Up to the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2021 there have been 733 housing starts with £26.1m of grant money committed. The programme for 2021/22 already has 782 units approved with a further £31.8m of grant being required. There are then additional 'new' opportunities to be captured with the support of MHCLG from our housing pipeline over the next 12 months. So, we are confident we can reach 2,000 homes, but we can't give an absolute guarantee because we cannot predict what the economy is going to do and what the delivery of housing will be over the next 12 months.*

11) Could the CA Board give (a) a best and (b) a worst case scenario for (i) the total amount of money received for affordable housing outside Cambridge by March 2022 and (ii) the total number of homes that will be built with that money?

*A: Discussions are ongoing with MHCLG as to how the housing programme will progress in its new form. There are already 733 housing starts and the CPCA has a further 782 units pre-approved by the Housing and Communities Committee to progress to start on site during the period April 2021 to March 2022 with a further £31.8m of grant being required. Then there are additional new opportunities to be captured with the support of MHCLG from within our housing pipeline over the next twelve months. That leaves a further 485 units to be delivered and we feel that with the support of MHCLG those opportunities will come forward in the next twelve months. What we can't guarantee is what the economy will be doing and what effect Covid will have during that period of time.*

Combined Authority Board 24 March 2021 (reconvened 26 March 2021)

Item 3.6: Independent Commission on Climate Change Interim Report

Amendment from Cllr Van de Weyer

The Combined Authority Board is recommended to:

- a) welcome the initial report of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Commission on Climate (CPICC) and formally thank the Chair and members of the Commission for their work so far;
- b) ~~develop a response to~~ **accept** the Commission recommendations **in principle, pending an assessment of their implementation, carried out** with the engagement of member councils and the Business Board, to **be considered** at an early future meeting of the Board.
- c) without prejudice to that full response, to:
  - i. immediately release £50,000 of revenue funding to provide support to the CPICC Fenland Peat Committee in the coming financial year; and
  - ii. Commission officers to commence preparatory work for the formation of the Climate Cabinet (as described in the CPICC report), as part of Overarching Recommendation 1.

(text removed shown as ~~struck through~~, additional text shown in **bold**)

Combined Authority Board 24 March 2021 (reconvened 26 March 2021)

Item 3.6: Independent Commission on Climate Change - Interim report

Amendment from Councillor Boden:

The Combined Authority Board is recommended to:

- a) welcome the initial report of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Commission on Climate (CPICC) and formally thank the Chair and members of the Commission for their work so far;
- b) develop a response to the Commission recommendations, with the engagement of member councils and the Business Board, to consider at an early future meeting of the Board.
- c) without prejudice to that full response, to:
  - iii. immediately release £50,000 of revenue funding to provide support to the CPICC Fenland Peat Committee in the coming financial year; and
  - iv. Commission officers to commence preparatory work for the formation of the Climate Cabinet (as described in the CPICC report), as part of Overarching Recommendation 1, **although in recognition of the non-executive role of the body, references to a 'climate cabinet' should be changed to 'climate working group'**.

(Additions shown in **bold text**)