



CAMBRIDGESHIRE & PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY: MINUTES

Date: Wednesday, 31st January 2018

Time: 10.30am – 11.55am

Present: J Palmer (Mayor)

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

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

125. APOLOGIES AND DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Apologies received from Councillor G Bull, and J Ablewhite.

Councillors Count and Holdich declared a non-statutory disclosable interest under the Code of Conduct in relation to minute 135, as Directors of the Local Enterprise Partnership Board. They reported that they did not have a conflict of interest but should the discussion reveal an interest they would make the Board aware and take the necessary action.

126. MINUTES – 20TH DECEMBER 2017

The minutes of the meeting held on 20th December 2017 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

127. PETITIONS

No petitions were received.

128. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

The Mayor reported that he proposed to take the two public questions which related to Agenda Item No.2.1 directly before that item. He informed the Board that one of the set of questions had arrived late. With the agreement of the Board, he suspended standing orders to enable that question to be answered.

129. FORWARD PLAN

The Board noted the Forward Plan of Executive Decisions dated to be published on 29 January 2018. The Mayor stated that the Forward Plan was updated on a regular basis.

It was resolved unanimously to approve the Forward Plan of Executive Decisions dated to be published on 29 January 2018.

130. CORPORATE GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK

The Legal Counsel and Monitoring Officer informed the Authority of work undertaken by the Governance Team and Audit Committee on the remaining elements of the governance framework to ensure high standards of conduct of its Members, and the Authority.

Attention was drawn to the procedure for dealing with complaints about the Mayor, members of the Authority or its committees. It was a statutory requirement to appoint at least one Independent Person to deal with allegations that a Member had breached the Members' Code of Conduct. The Independent Person acted as a consultee on the decisions made by the Monitoring Officer and Hearings Panel. It was proposed to recruit an Independent Person with an allowance of £250 per annum. The Legal Counsel and Monitoring Officer would then also look to establish a panel of independent persons from amongst constituent councils. It was noted that the Constitution would need to be amended to include the member complaints procedure.

The Board was advised of the procedure for dealing with corporate complaints. Members were informed that following approval by the Board, the Legal Counsel and Monitoring Officer would notify the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman. Attention was drawn to the Data Protection Policy, the Freedom of Information Policy and the publication scheme listing the types of information that was available or would be available on the Authority's website.

One Member asked for clarification regarding the appointment of the Independent Person and the establishment of a countywide panel. The Legal Counsel and Monitoring Officer reported that it was a statutory requirement for the Authority to have at least one Independent Person who would be paid an allowance to meet out of pocket expenses. However, it was also sensible to have arrangements in place to deal with any conflicts of interest which might arise. It was therefore proposed that the Legal Counsel and Monitoring Officer would work with the Monitoring Officers of constituent councils to establish a panel to draw from. There might need to be a discussion regarding allowances if the number of Independent Persons on the panel exceeded the number of constituent authorities.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Member Complaints Procedure

- (a) Approve the process for dealing with complaints about the Mayor, Members of the Combined Authority or its Committees for breach of the Code of Conduct (Appendix 1);
- (b) Delegate authority to the Legal Counsel and Monitoring Officer to select a suitable Independent Person for Member Complaints and approve a proposed allowance of £250 per annum (in lieu of expenses claims);
- (c) Request the Legal Counsel and Monitoring Officer to seek to set up a panel of Independent Persons for Member Complaints from amongst Constituent Council Independent Persons;
- (d) Agree to amend the constitution to include the member complaints procedure;

Corporate Complaints

- (e) Approve and adopt the complaints procedure;
- (f) Request Legal Counsel and Monitoring Officer to notify the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman of the Combined Authority's complaints procedure and to make any changes recommended by the Ombudsman; and

Data Protection Policy and Freedom of Information

- (g) Approve the Data Protection Policy (Appendix 3), the Freedom of Information Policy (Appendix 4) and the publication scheme listing the types of information that is available or will be made available on the Combined Authority website (Appendix 5).

131. APPOINTMENT INTERIM CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER AND SECTION 151 OFFICER

The Board was asked to consider the appointment of Rachel Musson as interim statutory Chief Finance Officer for the Combined Authority. Attention was drawn to Ms Musson's extensive senior management and Section 151 experience. The Portfolio Holder for Fiscal Responsibility reported that he had met and informally interviewed Ms Musson. He had full confidence in her abilities and recommended that she should be appointed. In response to a query regarding recruitment to the substantive post, the Chief Executive reported that he would be presenting the Board with a single staffing structure for the Combined Authority and the GCGP LEP, which would deal with senior posts.

It was resolved unanimously to:

appoint Rachel Musson as interim statutory Chief Finance Officer and S151 Officer to the Combined Authority.

132. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

The Mayor invited Mr Michael Page and Mr Antony Carpen to address the Board. *[The questions and responses are published at the following link:*

[Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority meeting 31/01/2018](#) and attached at Appendix A).

The Mayor invited Mr Page to submit a supplementary question. Mr Page expressed concern that the Mayor was not concerned with process. He drew attention to a tweet from the Mayor stating “We’ll build the innovative transport solutions, you check the paperwork”. He then drew attention to recent comments made by the Mayor in relation to action taken by Cambridge City Council on homelessness. He was concerned about the tone the Combined Authority was taking. In response, the Mayor stated that he expected to deliver on major projects.

The Mayor invited Mr Carpen to submit a supplementary question. Mr Carpen urged the Mayor to encourage the consultants to consider the history of previous transport schemes and why they had not been successful. He drew attention to archives which would provide some suitable lessons learnt, and useful tourism studies undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council and Cambridge City Council.

133. MASS RAPID TRANSPORT – STRATEGIC OPTIONS ASSESSMENT

The Portfolio Holder for Transport and Infrastructure introduced a report detailing the outcome of joint strategic options assessment study with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) to investigate potential mass rapid transit solutions. The study had established that there was a strong case to develop this initiative further. He informed the Board that it was requested to approve the recommendation to develop a Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC) and Options Appraisal Report for the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM) proposal. This proposal was a vital step in improving public transport for Cambridge and other areas, and he stressed the need to proceed as speedily as possible.

The Portfolio Holder for Transport and Infrastructure invited the Transport and Infrastructure Director to introduce the report in detail. Attention was drawn to the scope of the Mass Rapid Transport Study which included the study area and the aims. The key findings from the study had identified a strong strategic case for mass rapid transport that could support the wider economy. The Board was advised of the likely constraints which pointed strongly towards the need for tunnelled solutions for the mass transit network. Three options had been identified for more detailed evaluation and had been assessed against seven transport and six deliverability risks. The outcome of this evaluation was that CAM offered the best overall solutions without significant dis-benefits.

Attention was drawn to the capital costs of implementing the CAM proposal which were estimated to be in the region of £1.7bn. A number funding solutions would be explored during the subsequent development of the scheme. The Combined Authority would also be calling upon a number of bodies, including the GCP, to support it in achieving the best possible outcomes for the project. The Board was advised of the next steps in

the delivery of the mass rapid transport solution, which would involve a SOBC and an Options Appraisal Report. The cost of developing both documents was £600,000 which would be funded from the Combined Authority's £74m allocation from the Transforming Cities Fund. The Board noted the outline indicative delivery programme for the proposal.

One Member expressed support for taking the project forward. He acknowledged the range of issues which had been considered, and that a busway was not a solution. He stressed the importance of a high quality public transport solution for Cambridge which would benefit strategic growth further away from the city. He queried how the significant amount of funding would be used and the stages. The Chief Executive informed the Board that work on the SOBC would take place in accordance with the Authority's Assurance Framework which followed Treasury guidelines. The SOBC and Options Appraisal would be developed with further consultation with partners. He recognised the fact that the proposal would require a substantial financial model. The development of the scheme would therefore require a financial appraisal. He drew attention to the brakes in the programme which would allow for contributions whilst making progress.

The same Member highlighted the need for consistency in relation to the work being undertaken by the GCP on routes. He drew attention to the significant funding needed to progress the project and the timescale. He reminded the Board of the need to work with other bodies, including the GCP, which had been recognised in the consultant's report. Councillor Herbert therefore proposed the following amendment, seconded by Councillor Topping:

- (c) agree to liaise with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) to ensure GCP's current and future plans for high quality public transport corridors were consistent and readily adaptable to the emerging proposition for a CAM Metro network.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was carried unanimously.

Attention was drawn to the fact that Peterborough had been the fastest growing city over the last ten years and this was taking a toll on its road network. It was welcomed that the Combined Authority had identified funding to improve bottlenecks in the area. However, it was hoped that the Authority would consider a similar mass rapid transport solution for Peterborough in the future. The Mayor commented that the Authority should not limit its ambitions. However, he acknowledged the need to identify the right system for a city based on a number of factors including population. The Transport and Infrastructure Director reported that the next phase of the work would broaden out the geography. In response to a question regarding timescale, it was noted that it would be later in the year as a significant amount of further work was required.

In welcoming the report, one Member raised the importance of putting the infrastructure in first before housing rather than just to keep pace with growth. However, it was important that the project took into account the existing infrastructure. He suggested sharing the Combined Authority's experience with Oxford. He expressed concerns regarding funding as it was unlikely that the Government would provide the funding. The SOBC therefore needed to demonstrate strong financial viability with tracking to

ensure the money was being spent wisely. A balance needed to be struck between assurance and delivery.

One Member drew attention to the fact that the report was about recommending that more work be carried out to provide a more detailed consideration of the proposal including the costs. He reported that the public and business would not thank the Authority for delaying the project unduly. The Authority could have asked for more information particularly in relation to tourism but the consultant's report included a section on planning capacity for mass transit which reflected the demand from 2015 to 2031. The Authority therefore did not need to know the number of tourists as it had the overall number for demand. At the moment there was sufficient information to take a decision, the next iteration would provide more depth.

The same Member raised the importance of fine tuning the cost in relation to capital and revenue as a source of finance. He stressed the importance of having an indicative price which reflected an accurate summation and automatically included inflation. There was a need to match project aspiration with aspiration in relation to funding. He was satisfied that the £600,000 to develop a SOBC and Options Appraisal Report would follow regimented Treasury guidelines and was keen to progress the project without further delay. The Transport and Infrastructure Director reported that the Assurance Framework would be phased with stop points to ensure the right level of check and challenge.

The same Member raised a question in relation to future projects. He highlighted the need to ensure that future growth did not change the historic neighbourhood of Cambridge. There needed to be a discussion about what was appropriate for the core which might involve limiting office capacity, the height of buildings, and spreading wealth to a wider geography.

In conclusion, the Mayor commented that most people worked around the periphery of Cambridge. There were major problems getting across Cambridge particularly from the A14 and M11. The City had also experienced significant recent growth on the western university campus. The Authority therefore had to something to improve access for people outside of Cambridge by going under or through the city. Cambridge and Cambridgeshire was growing, the Authority wanted to spread the success by delivering a world-class public transport system across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. Investing in infrastructure was also the best way to solve the County's housing problems. The Authority could not ignore the problem and needed to be both innovative and bold. It was therefore important to move to the next stage.

It was resolved unanimously to

- (a) note the findings of the Cambridgeshire Mass Transit Strategic Options Assessment and the recommendation that the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro be carried forward for further development.
- (b) approve £600,000 to develop a Strategic Outline Business Case and an Options Appraisal Report for the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro proposal.

- (c) agree to liaise with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) to ensure GCP's current and future plans for high quality public transport corridors were consistent and readily adaptable to the emerging proposition for a CAM Metro network.

134. HOUSING: OFF SITE MANUFACTURE

The Mayor drew attention to two confidential appendices to this report. He did not think it necessary to debate these appendices as the Authority was only making a decision to defer this matter. However, if Members wished to discuss confidential appendices 1 and 2, it would be necessary to exclude the press and public.

The Portfolio Holder for Homes and Communities reminded the Board that when this issue had first been discussed, there had been great interest in the use of off-site construction as a way of addressing the problems in the construction industry. Members noted the main factors in support of the development of an off-site manufacturing facility. There were real commercial opportunities that could arise over the medium to long term. However, it was noted that the market for such a venture was immature. Members were informed that there were significant costs associated with the development and establishment of a factory. The Portfolio Holder was of the view this proposal, which was part of the Authority's Housing Strategy, would not work. He therefore recommended that the report should be deferred at this time to enable further work to be carried out to alleviate the current risks associated with this type of construction.

Councillor Clark declared a non-statutory disclosable interest under the Code of Conduct as his sons both worked for Kier Construction.

One Member expressed disappointment that the study had not answered all his questions. He was already aware that nobody was delivering modular off-site homes at a scale of 300 houses a year. He queried whether there was a modular construction method which could be scaled up to compete in the open market, and which options should the Authority consider. The comparability of different types of modular housing also needed to be considered in order to attract cost base housing. He did not support the proposal for a Full Business Case, as he felt that the level of detail which would identify whether it was worth proceeding to the next stage, could be obtained at less cost. He drew attention to the fact that the Federation of Master Builders had identified that 90% of the workforce was scheduled to retire in the next five to ten years, and there were not sufficient builders being trained to replace them. It was therefore possible that off-site manufacture might come into play if it was financially viable.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- defer the report detailing the contents of the Outline Business Case and the potential medium to long term commercial opportunity.

135. ESTABLISHING A NEW STRONGER PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR PARTNERSHIP IN CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH – BUSINESS BOARD

The Mayor asked the Chief Executive to leave the meeting whilst the shared Chief Executive role was discussed. He then invited the Legal Counsel and Monitoring Officer to present the report. Members were reminded that the LEP had agreed, subject to certain conditions, to dissolve. A new LEP in the form of a Business Board would be established working more closely to the Combined Authority through a unified strategic framework and a single staffing structure. This provided opportunity to have a single set of strategies. It was proposed to create a permanent shared Chief Executive role across the two organisations. If the Board agreed in principle, the Employment Committee would be asked to review the job description and to make recommendations on an appropriate salary level to the Combined Board in February.

Members expressed support for the proposal particularly as it would save the public purse. One Member reported that he had proposed that the LEP should sit inside the Board when the Combined Authority had first been established as it would have reduced bureaucracy. He raised the importance of moving forward with a strong message regarding the benefits of partnership between the Combined Authority and the new LEP, which reflected the public sector and the business community. It was important that the voice of the business community was not diluted. He felt that the Combined Authority and the new LEP could drive forward an evidence based strategic economic plan. His views were supported by the Mayor, he reminded the Board that an offer had been made to the previous Chairman of the LEP to work together. He reported that it was proposed that Councillor Roberts be appointed as the Chair of the Shadow Business Board until an independent representative was appointed.

It was resolved unanimously to agree:

- (a) in principle to the establishment of a single shared Chief Executive role across the Combined Authority and the new Local Enterprise Partnership;

The Chief Executive returned to the meeting. He outlined proposals to bring forward a new single staffing structure. One Member acknowledge the progress which had been made. He reminded the Board that discussions had started in September 2016 about bring the staffing structures together. It was regrettable that there had been no response from the LEP. He was keen to see an independent Board established and queried the process for ensuring that this happened. Councillor Roberts welcomed the proposal to appoint him Chair of the Shadow Board. He confirmed that there was a considerable amount of work to do in the setting up the new Business Board which would have different responsibilities to the LEP. The relationship between the Authority and the new Business Board would be clearly defined. Whilst business would have a clear voice, key decisions regarding expenditure would be the responsibility of the Combined Authority. There was a significant piece of work over the next six months in relation to sharing staff, as it was important to create capacity and resource arrangements properly.

One Member queried how the salaries for the new staffing structure could be met equally by the Combined Authority and the new Local Enterprise Partnership Business Board. The Chief Executive reported that the intention was to create an operation to serve two Boards with funding streams managed by the Combined Authority. He therefore proposed, as the report author, to remove the word “equally” from recommendation (d). The same Member also highlighted the need for representation on the new Board to be balanced geographically.

It was resolved unanimously to agree:

- (b) that the single staffing structure be reported to the February Board meeting;
- (c) that, in principle, the Combined Authority should explore new terms and conditions of employment for its new staffing structure;
- (d) that the salaries for the new staffing structure were to be met by the Combined Authority and the new Local Enterprise Partnership Business Board.

It was resolved to agree:

- (e) that Councillor Charles Roberts be appointed as the Chair of the Shadow Business Board.

136. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was resolved to note the date of the next meeting – Wednesday, 14 February 2018 at 10.30 am in the Civic Suite, Huntingdonshire District Council, Pathfinder House, St Mary's Street, Huntingdon, PE29 3TN

Mayor

CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY – 31ST JANUARY 2018

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question:	Answer:
1.	Mr Michael Page Cambridge Resident	The Mayor of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority	<p>On 8th December Mayor Palmer was reported in the Cambridge News as welcoming the consultants' report on the Rapid Mass Transit Options Appraisal, declaring that he was "very pleased" with it. Various illustrations taken from the report were also included in the article. However, seven weeks later, on the Friday before this meeting, the report in Appendix 1 has still not been published, nor has the consultant's brief in Appendix 2 for which an expenditure of £600,000 is proposed.</p> <p>My question is in four parts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If the mayor is so pleased with the report why can he not share it in full with the rest of us? 2. Are members of the CA Board satisfied that they can make important decisions today on this agenda item when key documents have not been made available in due time to the public and other councillors - in breach of Government guidelines on transparency? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The report was published on the Combined Authority website on 26 January. 2. There is no breach of Government guidelines. Legal advice has been given to this Board on the ability to consider the consultant's report. It is for each member to consider whether they can make a decision from the information available and given the time they have to consider it. Members have had 5 calendar days to review the report, and like our scrutiny members, have received an earlier presentation from the consultants explaining their findings. 3. The decision before the members is not to approve the detail of the consultant's brief, that is why we employ officers, but to agree whether we want to move to the next stage of the process. <p>The figure quoted in the recommendation is an estimate based upon the officer's expertise. Officers have an obligation to secure value for money under a competitive process and therefore the actual cost of the next stage is actually unknown, but will be lower than the budget we are approving. The actual cost of the contract will be made public through our future budget reports to the Board.</p>

			<p>3. Do members of the CA Board have an understanding of how the £600,000 figure has been arrived at and that it represents best value?</p> <p>4. Do Board members believe that the process we have witnessed will gain public confidence in this new Public Body?</p>	<p>4. The Board accepts that the consultant's report was published some 3 days after the agenda. Members have however seen the officers' report which summarised all of the key points of the consultant's report. That report was published with the agenda and provided us with a good understanding of the larger consultant's report.</p> <p>As Mayor, I believe that the public will gain confidence from seeing us deliver a transport system that is going to make a difference to their everyday lives. That's what I want to get on and deliver and I have confidence that the recommendations before me will move us towards that solution.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question	Answer
2.	Mr Antony Carpen	Mayor of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority	<p>Please could you ask the Mayor to use his discretion to enable me to ask a public Q of the consultants Steer, Davies, Gleave on their report, specifically:</p> <p>1)What assessment did the consultants make of the current and future levels of tourist growth?</p> <p>2)What assessment they made of the annual income likely to be generated by a scheme barring tourist coaches/traffic from the city and transferring passengers to light rail underground?</p> <p>3)What historical analyses the</p>	<p>As Mayor, I intend to ask the Board to suspend standing orders to allow me to respond publicly to these questions at the meeting.</p> <p>1. The consultants have advised that there is no explicit assumption made about future tourist growth. However, current and future tourism demand is represented in Cambridgeshire County Council's Cambridge Sub-Region Transport Model (CSRM) for 2015 and 2031. This has been used to inform the planning capacity analysis.</p> <p>The planning capacity is also based on peak hour flows, whereas tourism trips are typically spread over the day. Whilst tourism demand will be a key demand element, this spread will</p>

			<p>consultants did of past unexecuted transport schemes for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire?</p>	<p>provide a better balance of demand for the system.</p> <p>2. Detailed demand forecasts were not prepared as part of the study. Therefore, specific complementary interventions were not explicitly considered. However, the analysis to inform the planning capacity is based on a 'high growth/ high mode shift' scenario, which is intended to reflect the impact of Mass Transit in attracting car passengers / potential, in combination with complementary interventions (e.g. demand management, first and last mile – and potentially tourism demand as inferred by the question). Mass transit (whether LRT or CAM) offers the potential to promote and encourage more sustainable tourism access to the City, and provide additional revenues for the system.</p> <p>The consultants do not believe that such a scheme would alter the comparative assessment of options and the findings / recommendations made in the report.</p> <p>3. No specific analysis was undertaken. However, the consultant has experience of working on major schemes in Cambridge and the UK (including the Cambridge Guided Busway and Cambridge TIF proposals). As a result, the consultant has a good understanding of the local challenges in delivering such projects. This has informed the assessment of the deliverability risks associated with different modes.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>The consultant also undertook extensive engagement with a range of stakeholders who have experience of developing major schemes in the area. This has helped to shape the proposals and ensure that they are appropriate, deliverable and achievable in a Greater Cambridge context.</p> <p>This is not to understate the challenge of major infrastructure, especially in relation to tunnelling and underground stations, but CAM represents the most deliverable of the options.</p>
--	--	--	--	--