



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE
& PETERBOROUGH**
COMBINED AUTHORITY

CAMBRIDGESHIRE & PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY: MINUTES

Date: Wednesday 27th March 2019

Time: 10.30am – 2.05pm (adjourned between 12.55-1.20pm)

Venue: Kreis Viersen Room, Shire Hall, Castle Street, Cambridge CB3 0AP

Present: J Palmer (Mayor)

Councillors G Bull – Huntingdonshire District Council, S Count - Cambridgeshire County Council, L Herbert – Cambridge City Council, J Holdich – Peterborough City Council, C Roberts - East Cambridgeshire District Council, C Seaton – Fenland District Council and B Smith – South Cambridgeshire District Council

Professor A Neely – Vice Chair, Business Board

Observers: J Ablewhite (Police and Crime Commissioner), J Bawden (Clinical Commissioning Group) (to 12.30pm) and Councillor D Over (Vice Chairman, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority)

316. ANNOUNCEMENTS, APOLOGIES AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Mayor stated that he had three important announcements to make. The Combined Authority had been awarded £227m for the development of 7,000+ houses at the Cambridge North East fringe. This had the potential to deliver around 8,000 homes, including affordable housing, and around 7,000 new jobs. This was a brownfield site in a well-connected area, supported by Cambridge North station and close to centres of employment like Cambridge Science Park. Only Combined Authorities were able to apply for this funding and the success of this bid recognised the significant contribution that the Combined Authority could make to the area. The Mayor expressed his thanks to the team at Cambridge City Council who had worked hard on the business case to support the application.

In its Spring statement, the Government had also announced an investment of £45m in the European Biomaterials Institute in Cambridge. This investment a commitment to ensuring that the United Kingdom remained globally competitive in the life sciences.

The Mayor stated that he had taken an urgent decision earlier in the week in order to accept £90,000 from the Government to spend on homeless veterans. This funding had to be spent by year end so he had exercised his power to accept it. The Mayor expressed his gratitude to Councillor Count, the Leader of Cambridgeshire County Council, who had arranged through the County for this funding to be spent on various

projects across the seven constituent councils within the Combined Authority in accordance with the deadline set by Government.

Apologies were received from A Khalid, Chair of the Business Board (substituted by Professor A Neely).

There were no declarations of interest.

317. MINUTES – 27th February 2019

The minutes of the meeting on 27th February 2019 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

318. PETITIONS

No petitions were received.

319. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

The Mayor invited Councillor Graham Wilson, John Thackray, Councillor Mrs Bridget Flanagan and Mal Schofield to address the Board. *(The questions and responses are published at the following link: [Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board meeting 27 March 2019](#) and attached at **Appendix A**)*

As a supplementary question, Councillor Wilson asked whether there would be consultation on the specification for work and during the study. The Mayor stated that there was no preferred option at this stage and that any Combined Authority programme would take full account of the views of local partners and organisations.

As a supplementary comment, Mr Schofield noted a lack of regular official data on traffic behaviour and modal shift and commented that congestion reduction was directly linked to significant modal shift. He further commented that he believed that the development of a strategic case for the CAM Metro was dependent on a detailed understanding of 'trip-chaining'. The Mayor acknowledged these comments.

The Mayor thanked the members of the public for attending and for their robust questions.

320. FORWARD PLAN

It was resolved unanimously to note the Forward Plan.

321. DESIGNATION OF STATUTORY OFFICER

The Board noted that it was a statutory requirement to appoint a Scrutiny Officer. The current post holder would shortly be starting a period of maternity leave so a new post holder was required until her return.

Councillor Smith asked whether the appointment would be made on a full-time basis. Ms Sawyer, Interim Joint Chief Executive, confirmed that the post was full-time. The Scrutiny Officer would continue to provide some support to the Audit and Governance Committee, but supporting the Overview and Scrutiny Committee would remain their primary focus.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Designate Emma Powley as Scrutiny Officer for the duration of the maternity leave of the current officer

322. APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE AND MONITORING OFFICER

Following the meeting of the Employment Committee on 26 March 2019 a revised report was tabled which recommended that the current arrangement of interim Joint Chief Executives should continue until May 2019. A further report would be submitted then regarding future arrangements for the Chief Executive role.

Councillor Herbert commented that it was disappointing that the Board was not yet in a position to make a permanent appointment. The previous recruitment round had taken seven months and he wanted to move quickly to re-start the process. To that end he proposed an amendment to the tabled report, seconded by Councillor Smith, that:

- c) The Combined Authority start the process now to appoint a Chief Executive.

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

Councillor Count commented that he did want to proceed quickly to appoint a new Chief Executive. However, he felt that it was important that lessons were learned first from the previous recruitment exercise. For that reason, he had abstained from voting on the amendment.

Councillor Bull stated that he had voted against the amendment as he felt a little time should be taken to refine the job description. He would though want to proceed quickly once this was done.

Councillor Smith commented that she had not felt supported during the Employment Committee as no Combined Authority or Human Resources officer had been present. She also asked how the Committee's decision had been recorded. Mr John Hill, Interim Joint Chief Executive, commented that a Democratic Services Officer had been present to open the meeting, but that he had felt it would not be a good use of their time to remain for the duration of the meeting. Lessons had been learned and an officer would remain present throughout the meeting next time. The Committee's decision had been recorded by a member of the Mayor's staff and given immediately to the Interim Joint Chief Executives. Councillor Smith commented that she would follow this up outside of the meeting with the Interim Joint Chief Executives.

It was resolved to:

- a) Extend the existing appointment of the interim Joint Chief Executives, John Hill and Kim Sawyer until the annual meeting in May 2019;
- b) Appoint Mr Howard Norris as the Monitoring Officer until the annual meeting in May 2019.

The Mayor expressed his thanks to both Interim Joint Chief Executives for their exceptional work to date. Under their leadership the organisation was now one of the leanest of all Combined Authorities and he was comfortable that this would remain the case until a substantive appointment could be made.

323. BUDGET MONITOR UPDATE

Councillor Count, Portfolio Holder for Investment and Finance, stated that the report set out spend to the 31 January 2019 against the 2018/19 budget. Work was to continue to produce an increasingly meaningful document for the Board and public. Within the variances reported some represented genuine underspends whilst others related to projects which would require some budget carry forward. Some of the apparent capital underspends were due to contractors having not yet billed for work carried out and this would be reflected in the year-end figures.

The Mayor stated that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had given notice of two comments on the report. He invited Councillor Mike Sargeant, Vice Chairman of the Committee, to share these with the Board. Councillor Sargeant commented that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee would like to ask whether future budget monitoring reports could include information relating to spend on housing. The Committee also asked that information contained within the Capital Programme should differentiate between cash flow and capital, for example the loan to East Cambridgeshire District Council.

In response, the Interim Chief Finance Officer stated that the Budget Monitor Report was designed as more of an over-arching report, but that the detailed information which sat behind it was available elsewhere. For example, information on expenditure on the housing programme had been submitted to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in February. In relation to cash flow and capital spend, the money spent on East Cambridgeshire project was approved in the form of a loan, but would be shown as spend in the final accounts.

Councillor Herbert commented that the loan to East Cambridgeshire District Council and other projects such as the RAF hospital site in Ely involved large sums of money so the Board did need to look at balances and know if it was sitting on significant sums. He asked whether a year-end report would be submitted in May and whether any major changes to the current position were anticipated. The Interim Chief Finance Officer stated that there had been a greater focus on the predicted outturns contained in the March report so they were expected to be fairly close to the final outturn figures. There was a requirement to publish the draft accounts by 31 May 2019 when they would be submitted to the Audit and Governance Committee.

Councillor Smith queried the assertion that contractors were not always invoicing the Authority in a timely manner and asked how quickly the Authority paid invoices once they were received. The Interim Chief Finance Officer stated that most capital works were managed by third parties such as the City or County Council so it was those organisations that were responsible for paying contractors. Invoices received from those Councils would be paid within the specified timeframe as part of the monthly payment run, but some bills were received quite late. Councillor Count clarified that bills were not necessarily submitted late, but that some contractors might choose not to invoice the Council until several stages of work had been completed.

Councillor Bull commented that the use of commitment accounting would enable spend to be tracked more clearly. The Interim Chief Finance Officer stated that commitment accounting would be implemented from the start of the 2019/20 financial year.

Councillor Herbert asked whether anything more had been heard in relation to the previous Interim Chief Finance Officer Karl Fenlon's departure with one month's salary. Ms Sawyer, Interim Joint Chief Executive, stated that the Mayor had previously stated that Mr Fenlon had been given one month's notice and a month's salary on his

departure. That statement was correct at the time it was made, but Mr Fenlon had since been in touch regarding his contract and further discussions were taking place on this.

It was resolved to:

Note the financial position of the Combined Authority for the year to date

324. HOUSING DEVELOPMENT COMPANY

The report proposed the establishment of a Combined Authority Trading Company (CATC) with a Housing Development Company (DevCo). This was consistent with the Housing Strategy approved by the Board on 26 September 2018 and would enable the Authority to move quickly when project-specific opportunities for housing delivery were identified.

The Mayor noted that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had given notice of three comments on this report and he invited Councillor Sargeant to share these with the Board. Councillor Sargeant asked whether the Board could reassure the Overview and Scrutiny Committee that the Director of Housing would not be distracted from his commitment to provide 100,000 new homes once seconded to the Development Company. The Committee also asked whether there would be conflict and/or competition with other Councils that had set up and continued to run their own Housing Development Companies. Finally, the Committee had asked what mechanisms would be used for Member scrutiny and engagement of the Development Company.

The Mayor stated that the Director of Housing's role was primarily to deliver housing and DevCo would be a tool in achieving this. He was confident that the postholder was capable of combining both roles. DevCo would not be in competition with existing Local Authority Housing Development Companies in the region, but would work collaboratively alongside them. DevCo would be wholly owned by the Combined Authority so the same scrutiny rules would apply. Scrutiny of DevCo's work by the Board would be achieved through its submission of an annual business plan and reports to the Board for approval. In addition, the Mayor and one Deputy Mayor would sit on the Board of the Combined Authority Trading Company.

Councillor Herbert commented that he was concerned about potential overheads given that it would cost c£600k to set up. Whilst recognising that commercial considerations would exist in relation to some of the information held by the company there was a need to establish appropriate governance and scrutiny arrangements to ensure continued Member oversight. The five year funding from Government was based on the delivery of 2,000 affordable homes, but he felt the focus on this had been lost. The Director of Housing stated that there would be different ways open to a trading company to deliver this goal, for example by working with existing Local Authority trading companies in the area. The Authority did not want to rely solely on grant to providers to deliver the 2,000 affordable homes target. The need for transparency was fully recognised and he would be happy to report both to the Housing and Communities Committee and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in addition to providing reports to the Board.

Councillor Smith commented that she was glad to see that Board members' comments on governance made during informal discussion of the proposals were reflected in the report. However, she would not be supporting the proposals as she did not see why DevCo would be better placed to deliver the Board's housing aims than joint ventures or using existing experienced providers. In her view it would be a waste of money.

Councillor Count stated that the Board had approved the Housing Strategy and toolkit and that the creation of DevCo was embedded within this. Some constituent councils had their own housing development companies and the benefits of those could be seen, so he was unclear why the Combined Authority should not do the same. DevCo would offer an extra resource to enable the Authority to deliver housing at speed and positively influence the housing market in Cambridgeshire. Councillor Count asked whether the Authority needed a DevCo to be able to enter into a joint venture. The Director of Housing stated that he thought this was the case. It offered a sensible route for managing risk and would allow some starts on site that would not otherwise happen.

Professor Neely commented that the University of Cambridge operated what was effectively a DevCo with six or seven non-executive directors offering a broad spread of skills. He asked what professional commercial skills would be held by those on the CATC and DevCo Boards. Officers stated that both the CATC Board and the DevCo Board would have an Independent Chairman with relevant experience and expertise in addition to the Director of Housing.

Councillor Smith requested that a recorded vote be taken. The voting pattern was:

Mayor James Palmer	Abstain
Councillor G Bull	For
Councillor S Count	For
Councillor L Herbert	Abstain
Councillor J Holdich	For
Professor A Neely	For
Councillor C Roberts	For
Councillor C Seaton	For
Councillor B Smith	Against

It was resolved by a majority to:

- a) Approve the Business Case for establishing a Combined Authority Trading Company (CATC) as detailed in Appendix 1;
- b) Approve the Combined Authority Trading Company Business Plan and as detailed in Appendix 2;
- c) Approve the Housing Development Company (DevCo) business plan as detailed in Appendix 3
- d) Approve the funding strategy for the Housing Development Company (paragraph 6);
- e) Approve the composition of the CATC Board as set out in Appendix 2 (ref: P8 para 4.1.1 and P9 para 4.1.2);

Furthermore, in order to implement a)-c), authorise and approve:

- f) The Chief Executive to enter into a loan agreement with CATC as detailed in paragraph 6;
- g) The Chief Executive and the Corporate Services Director to complete the necessary legal documentation to implement the above.

325. CAM METRO – STRATEGIC OUTLINE BUSINESS CASE

The Mayor stated that Appendix 2 to the report was exempt from publication under Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, in that it contained information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information). He asked if any member of the Board wished to discuss the exempt appendix. No member expressed the wish to do so.

The Mayor stated that he had received notice that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had a number of comments on the report and he invited Councillor Sargeant to share these with the Board. Councillor Sargeant commented that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee was concerned that there was no risk assessment of the cases in the Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC). The Committee asked whether an assurance could be given that there would be alignment of the CAM Metro with other public transport systems. The Overview and Scrutiny would want proper governance be put in place for all aspects of CAM and not just the provision of the tunnels and underground stations as identified in the SOBC. The Committee had raised some concerns around the financial case and felt that it was unfortunate that Committee members had not been able to see the exempt appendix. The Overview and Scrutiny wished to thank the Mayor for his agreement that the gaps and concerns that they had raised regarding the SOBC compared with the questions that they identified with the Centre for Public Scrutiny would be taken into account by the Mayor and officers in drawing up the Outline Business Case. Finally, the Committee noted that engagement would be happening shortly with the Department for Transport in respect of the Strategic Outline Business Case.

The Interim Director of Transport stated that the Strategic Outline Business Case was fully compliant with Department of Transport requirements and in his view demonstrated a compelling case. Councillor Sargeant commented that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had perhaps expected more of the SOBC, but that Committee members had welcomed the Interim Director of Transport's offer to work with them. They had also welcomed an offer by Ms Sawyer, Interim Joint Chief Executive, to work with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee regarding early access to public reports and access to exempt reports.

The Mayor stated that all of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's comments would be noted and that some points such as risk assessments would be addressed in the development of the Outline Business Case, if this was approved. The Authority was already working with partners such as Network Rail, Highways England and the East West Rail OxCam Group to try to ensure that the CAM would be aligned with the current and future transport network. He would be happy to work with the Overview and Scrutiny Committee regarding governance arrangements. Indicative costings suggested a £4 return for every £1 invested.

Councillor Herbert commented that the findings were impressive and that the economic benefits could be transformational. Cambridge City Council supported the proposals and work being undertaken by the Greater Cambridge Partnership would support the early stages. He did see a role for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee going forward and commented that further thought was needed regarding the funding mechanism and how this would be taken forward. Schemes elsewhere showed that it could take several years to put such a mechanism in place so there was a need to make progress on this. Thought was also needed on the interim measures needed until the project was delivered. The Mayor stated that the only way to deliver the project would be through partnership working and clear governance arrangements and he welcomed Cambridge

City Council's support and the work being done by the Greater Cambridge Partnership on early routes. If approved by the Board, detailed work would begin to engage with Government and potential partners to put in place the mechanisms needed to deliver the scheme with a target delivery date of 2023-29.

Councillor Smith commented that South Cambridgeshire District Council was supportive of the proposals. Their Local Plan was predicated on routes into the City whilst aiming to reduce car usage and improve air quality. However, she did question whether the £1m sought for the next phase of work represented the total cost involved. The Mayor stated that the Board was being asked to commit £1m for the next phase of work, but that private sector partners would also be invited to contribute to demonstrate to Government a collective commitment to the project. There would though be no delay whilst private sector contributions were sought.

Councillor Count welcomed the proposals, commenting that action was required and that all other potential solutions were inferior to those proposed. A failure to act would turn off the tap of economic growth in the area and would not deliver on the Devolution Deal. The proposals offered an inclusive solution which would be of benefit both to the City and beyond, but it would only work as part of a complete package of measures. He remained opposed to any form of congestion charging unless as a last resort and judged that the creation of a great public transport option could achieve the required reduction in private vehicle usage.

Councillor Holdich welcomed the unity within the Board on this project. He paid tribute to the Mayor for the passion and drive with which he had driven the project forward, despite the significant criticism he had faced.

Councillor Roberts welcomed the proposals, but sought reassurance that the joint appointment of a CAM programme director by the Combined Authority and the Greater Cambridge Partnership would be taken forward straight away.

Professor Neely commented that the Business Board wished to add its support to the SOBC which represented an exciting development. He suggested the need for some value engineering at an early stage and encouraged early engagement with the Business Board in order to fully involve the local business community.

The Mayor stated that whilst schemes of this type were undoubtedly expensive the alternative of an extensive road building project would be far more costly. In comparison, the CAM Metro scheme offered significant value for money. To deliver it would take time, effort and collaboration across public and private sector organisations and political groups, but the result would be transformational.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note that the CAM SOBC has been founded upon CPIER growth scenarios as set out in section 2.6 to 2.9.
- b) Note the strong strategic and economic case made in the SOBC for the CAM and that this case has been made drawing upon only 50% of the total potential economic growth in the CPIER report.
- c) Note the links between the timeline of the CAM outline business case and the Non-Statutory Spatial Plan.

- d) Agree that the funding solution for the CAM will be drawn from blend of sources as set out in section 3.9.
- e) Agree to release £1m of funding from the 2019/20 budget for the procurement and development of the Outline Business Case, the accompanying technical packages (including funding) and programme of stakeholder engagement.
- f) Agree to delegate authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chair of the Transport and Infrastructure Committee, to enter into the contractual relationships following the procurement of the external consultants required to undertake the Outline Business Case and accompanying technical packages

326. CHANGE TO THE ORDER OF BUSINESS

The Mayor stated that the Clinical Commissioning Group representative needed to leave the meeting at 12.30pm so in order to facilitate their contribution to discussion of the Local Industrial Strategy the order of business would be changed from the published agenda to take this item next.

327. LOCAL INDUSTRIAL STRATEGY

The report contained the inaugural Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Industrial Strategy (LIS). This was the product of a highly collaborative approach which was recognised as an exemplar within the OxCam Arc. The Strategy had been considered by the Business Board earlier in the week and the report and recommendations were commended to the Board for review and approval.

The Clinical Commissioning Group representative commended the LIS and the engagement which had taken place around it. However, she expressed concern that the three year funding formula applied to the NHS was not keeping pace with economic growth in the region. The NHS formula predicted that growth in Cambridgeshire would be less than the national average, but this did not reflect the local experience.

The Police and Crime Commissioner concurred with these observations. Cambridgeshire was one of the top three areas for growth nationally, but in the bottom three for the funding received by essential services to support that growth. If the county received the average of public spend this would equate to an extra £21m which would have a big impact on the services which could be provided. This was an historic position which had existed under various Governments, but he judged that there was a need for the Board to press for funding for public sector services to support the county's growth. The Vice Chair of the Business Board confirmed that there would be further dialogue with Government regarding the LIS and undertook to take back the points which had been made regarding the need to support public services to enable economic growth.

Councillor Herbert commented that as a group of Local Authorities he felt that more work was needed on the cost implications of growth. It was not possible to create successful new communities without the services needed to support them. More broadly, he commended the Director for Business and Skills and his team for his work on the LIS. It was in his view an excellent document which reflected the voice of business and characterised the challenges faced within the county.

Councillor Count commented that he too felt the LIS was an excellent document and it was his understanding was that this view was shared by Government. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review (CPIER) report and

the LIS represented a step change in comparison to the reviews produced previously by the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and clearly set out Cambridgeshire's needs to Government. He welcomed the comments made by the Clinical Commissioning Group representative and the Police and Crime Commissioner and commented that the County Council had engaged in extensive lobbying on a fairer funding formula. The CPIER report had indicated that the use of outdated Office of National Statistics (ONS) figures could cost the county £60m.

The Mayor stated that he supported the comments made by the Clinical Commissioning Group representative and the Police and Crime Commissioner and that he was aware that Councillors Count and Holdich were also very aware of the issue in their capacity as Leaders of upper tier Authorities. He would be happy as Mayor to work alongside Cambridgeshire County Council, Peterborough City Council, the Clinical Commissioning Group, the Police and Crime Commissioner and other key partners and stakeholders in pressing this with Government.

It was resolved to:

- a) Approve the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Industrial Strategy to the Combined Authority Board for approval
- b) Delegate authority to the Business Board and the Director of Business and Skills, in consultation with the Chair of the Housing and Communities Committee, to take the Industrial Strategy through the remaining stages of national sign-off, and refine.

328. A10 CORRIDOR – STRATEGIC OUTLINE CASE AND NEXT STEPS

The Board received a progress report on the A10 Corridor project and considered the proposed next steps.

The Mayor stated that he had received notice that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee wished to comment on the report and invited Councillor Sargeant to share the Committee's views with the Board. Councillor Sargeant reported that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee was concerned that highly rated junction improvements were not being considered as part of the proposed next steps and felt this was something the Authority needed to drive forward. The Committee also sought clarification of whether consideration of climate change and environmental issues had been given due weight in respect of the proposed improvements to the A10. The Interim Director of Transport stated that the focus of this report was the A10 Dualling project and that it was anticipated that junction improvements would follow on as part of developers' contributions. If that did not happen those junction improvements could subsequently be brought to the Board for consideration. He confirmed that environmental factors would be considered as part of the process.

Councillor Smith commented that the Authority had a statutory obligation to mitigate against environmental impact, but that her view was that it should go further and aim to build in net gains. She strongly supported the proposed dualling of the A10, but felt that it would be remiss of the Combined Authority not to take forward some work on junction improvements, with the funding coming from developers where appropriate and relevant. She felt that the Combined Authority should show strong leadership of the project and, with the agreement of the Mayor, suggested that a report be brought to a future Leaders' strategy session.

Councillor Count commented that any projects should reflect the environmental goals to which the Combined Authority was already committed.

Councillor Herbert commented that there was a need for a fast public transport link and that he could not see how people could be encouraged make less use of their cars if the A10 was dualled with no public transport alternative. The Interim Director of Transport stated that a number of transport interventions would run alongside the proposed dualling of the A10 to provide public transport alternatives, such as the CAM Metro and the relocation of Waterbeach Station. The Authority would be working with the Greater Cambridge Partnership and other partners to create a comprehensive package of transport interventions along the A10 Corridor.

The Mayor asked whether the Strategic Outline Business Case for the A10 Dualling Project would take account of all junctions. The Interim Director of Transport stated that it would involve specific projects around some junctions, but not all.

Councillor Smith proposed an amendment to recommendations (b) and e), seconded by Councillor Holdich, that:

b) Agree to release £500k of funding from the 2019/20 budget for the procurement and development of the Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC) for the ~~A10 Dualling Project~~ :

- i. the A10 Dualling Project;*
- ii. A10 junction improvement projects.*

e) Approve the commencement of procurement of a professional services consultancy to undertake the work required to progress to SOBC for ~~A10 Dualling~~:

- i. A10 Dualling;*
- ii. A10 junction upgrades.*

On being put the vote, the amendment was carried.

The Mayor stated that the A10 represented a major route into the Fens and Ely, but it was congested and dangerous. The Combined Authority was doing all that it could to encourage and develop alternatives to road use, including through discussions with Network Rail to have more trains stopping at Cambridge North and more and longer trains to Fenland stations. However, the A10 remained an important element of the transport infrastructure in the north of the county and he supported the proposals that it should be dualled.

It was resolved to:

b) Note the results of the A10 Corridor Strategic Outline Case and associated reports.

c) Agree to release £500k of funding from the 2019/20 budget for the procurement and development of the Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC) for:

- iii. the A10 Dualling Project;*
- iv. A10 junction improvement projects.*

- d) Note the additional projects related to the A10 Corridor (Modal-shift interventions and junction improvements), and that if necessary business cases for these projects will be brought forward separately.
- e) Approve the approach towards engaging with the Department for Transport on funding streams for the A10;
- f) Approve the commencement of procurement of a professional services consultancy to undertake the work required to progress to SOBC for:
 - iii. A10 Dualling;
 - iv. A10 junction upgrades.
- g) Delegate Authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chair of the Transport and Infrastructure Committee, to agree and proceed with the appointment of a professional services consultancy following the completion of an appropriate procurement procedure.

(The meeting was adjourned from 12.55-1.20pm)

329. BUS REFORM TASK FORCE – GOVERNANCE AND SUBSIDIES

The Board considered a report which sought approval for the governance arrangements for the Bus Reform Task Force and the work required to design and implement a system for the evaluation and award of bus subsidies.

The Mayor stated that he had received notice that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had a comment on the report and invited Councillor Sargeant to address the Board. Councillor Sargeant commented that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee was concerned that the recommendations included in the report differed from those agreed at the Board's meeting in January 2019 and asked if this could be clarified. The Interim Director of Transport stated that the recommendation agreed by the Board in January 2019 to develop and deliver a business case assessment in Quarter 1 of 2021 still stood and that the Task Force would prepare a business case. The first stage would be to develop a brief and then commission providers to test this. It was envisaged that the brief would be produced around September/ October 2019 with preparation of a business case by autumn 2020 and a decision in spring 2021.

Councillor Count commented that he was in favour of the recommendations. There were powers available to the Mayor and Combined Authority that were not available to the county council and it provided an opportunity to look again at the systems in place.

Councillor Herbert commented that he supported the proposals. In his view there was a need to be clear about how much money was available. More investment was needed in bus services and, whilst he acknowledged the pressure they faced, he expressed the hope that both the County Council and Peterborough City Council would continue to support this.

Councillor Smith commented that she was supportive of this work. She felt that an element of rescue represented a recurring theme and suggested early engagement with the Bus Users' Association.

Councillor Seaton commented that he supported the proposals. Speaking from the perspective of a rural area with limited arterial roads he expressed the hope that the bus network could be used to connect villages into key transport hubs.

The Mayor stated that many of the reports on the agenda were transport-based and related to short, medium and long-term projects to improve transport across Cambridgeshire. He had met with representatives of Whippet and Stagecoach and believed that the opportunity existed for an enhanced partnership. The Combined Authority would work with partners where possible to deliver improvements in the short-term. In the medium term it would explore franchising opportunities whilst in the long-term the aim would be to link buses into the CAM Metro.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Approve the governance arrangements for the Bus Reform Task Force including proposals for member engagement;
- b) Approve the work required to design and implement a system for the evaluation and award of bus subsidies
- c) Approval to draw-down up to £400k, of the £1m allocated within the 2019/20 budget, to commence the work of the Bus Reform task force including preparing the brief, bus subsidy assessment framework and procuring external consultancy support for the business case.
- d) Delegate authority to the Transport Committee to spend funding within the allocated £1M budget upon recommendation from the Bus Reform Task Group.

330. CAMBRIDGE SOUTH STATION (INTERIM SOLUTION)

The Board considered a report requesting the release of funds identified for the Cambridge South Station (Interim Solution) project in the 2019/20 budget in order to appoint consultants to produce a report detailing the feasibility of implementing an interim solution on an accelerated timescale and the likely capital and revenue costs to do so. This would complement a larger piece of work regarding a permanent solution for Cambridge South Station.

Councillor Herbert commented that he supported efforts to bring the project forward faster, but that pressure also needed to be maintained on Network Rail to deliver the permanent solution by 2025.

The Mayor stated that Government timelines on Cambridge South Station were of concern to him. It was currently dependent on the delivery of East/ West Rail, but at present there were no guarantees about the delivery of this scheme. The Board must consider whether to accept that Cambridge South Station would be delivered in accordance with an uncertain Government timeframe or whether it should act now.

Councillor Smith questioned the potential cost of an interim solution, commenting that she was slightly concerned that the Board might be committing itself to expenditure that might subsequently prove to have been better spent elsewhere. The Mayor commented that this was a valid concern, but the alternative was to discount a possible interim solution and rely instead on the delivery of East/ West Rail.

Councillor Count commented that the Board would only know whether a viable interim solution was possible when the consultants' report was received. Should they find that no viable interim solution existed then the Board would have spent £100k which could have been directed elsewhere. However, if a viable solution was identified this could make a significant difference. Councillor Count commented that he had been intending

to abstain from this vote, but on balance he had decided to vote in favour of the recommendations as he judged the Board needed to send a clear message to Government about the strength of its support for Cambridge South Station.

Professor Neely commented that there was always a danger that an interim solution could become a permanent solution. He suggested that the consultants' brief include the criteria that they consider how the connection to East/ West Rail would be made to ensure that this was factored in.

The Mayor stated that considerable work had already taken place in support of the Cambridge South Station project, including the financial commitments made by the Greater Cambridge Partnership and AstraZeneca alongside the Combined Authority. The sums involved were significant, but in his view they were worth it.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Release the £100k allocated in the 2019/20 budget under the *Cambridge South Station – Interim Concept*.
- b) Delegate authority to the Chief Executive to appoint an external consultant to deliver a Cambridge South Station – Interim Station Study following the conclusion of the procurement process.

331. HUNTINGDON THIRD RIVER CROSSING

The Board considered a report seeking approval for the release of funding for the procurement and development of a Huntingdon Third River Crossing feasibility study. The Mayor expressed his thanks to the three public questioners who had asked questions on this item and who had remained present to hear the debate.

Councillor Bull welcomed the report, commenting that a Third River Crossing had been referenced in the Devolution Deal and that previous under-investment had led to a lack of resilience in the transport links between Huntingdon, Godmanchester and St Ives. Without wishing to pre-judge the findings of the feasibility study if it was approved, his view was that a third river crossing could potentially have a positive impact both within Huntingdonshire itself and beyond into Fenland. He was though mindful of the comments and questions raised earlier in the meeting by local councillors and residents. The Ouse Valley was a special landscape and the environmental impact of any proposals must be given full and careful consideration. However, it should not be assumed that the environmental impact of a third river crossing would necessarily be wholly negative. If approved, the feasibility study would explore this further.

Councillor Seaton commented that, subject to the findings of the feasibility study, a third river crossing could have far-reaching consequences with the potential to open up routes to Chatteris and the Fens. On this basis he fully supported the feasibility study.

The Mayor welcomed Board members' support for the proposed feasibility study.

It was resolved to:

- a) Agree to release £200k of funding from the 2019/20 and carry forward £198k from 2018/19 for the procurement and development of the Huntingdon Third River Crossing feasibility study

- b) Delegate authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chair of the Transport and Infrastructure Committee, to enter into the contractual relationships following the procurement of the external consultants required to undertake the study

332. A505: STRATEGIC STUDY

The Board received a report seeking authority to commission a multi-modal transport study of the A505 corridor and how this would interact with the proposed CAM Metro route serving the area.

Councillor Smith welcomed the report, commenting that the A505 corridor was ever more critical within South Cambridgeshire. The sooner this could happen the better as it was important to the Board's wider ambitions on growth and jobs. Councillor Count endorsed this view, noting that it was proposed to release a £1m allocation within the 2018/19 capital budget to support this.

The Mayor welcomed the Board's support for the project.

It was resolved to:

- a) Endorse the commissioning of a multi-modal strategic transport study for the A505 corridor;
- b) Release to CCC the £1m allocation within 2018/19 capital budget;
- c) Agree the project inception and instruct officers to commence the procurement by competitive tender of this work;
- d) Following the completion of the procurement, delegate authority for contract award to the Chief Executive Officer, in consultation with the Chair of the Transport and Infrastructure Committee.

333. ADULT EDUCATION BUDGET: DELEGATION OF GRANT PROVISION FOR 2019/20 ACADEMIC YEAR

The Board received a report seeking its agreement to delegate authority to award the Adult Education Budget (AEB) Grant allocation to twelve local colleges and Local Authority Providers in April 2019. This would include a variance of up to 25% on the condition that a new learning aim or approach was demonstrated which was in line with the Combined Authority's Strategic Priorities. Councillor Holdich commented that he was proposing an amendment to the recommendations, seconded by Councillor Roberts, to delegate authority to an officer in consultation with an elected member in accordance with the Board's usual practice.

It was resolved to:

Provide delegated authority to the Director of Business & Skills, in consultation with the Chair of the Skills Committee, to award Grants to the 12 Grant Funded Providers of AEB upon successful completion of Delivery Plans including a variance of up to a 25% on the condition that a new learning aim or approach is demonstrated in line with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) Strategic Priorities.

334. MONITORING AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

The Board considered a report which sought approval of the proposed 2019 Monitoring and Evaluation Framework. Significant sums of money were devolved to the Combined Authority and it was a requirement of Government that a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework be put in place in order to support effective decision-making and measure the impact of investment decisions.

Councillor Herbert asked about the process for reporting back to Government. The Director of Strategy and Assurance stated that the position would be reviewed at the end of the first five years following the Devolution Deal. It was too soon to know exactly what format this would take, but he confirmed that Board members would be involved.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Agree the 2019 Monitoring & Evaluation Framework for the Combined Authority.
- b) Note the resource implications for effective Monitoring & Evaluation to be delivered alongside the Combined Authority's major projects.

335. GROWTH DEAL PROJECT PROPOSALS MARCH 2019

Professor Neely commented that the Business Board had met on 25 March 2019 at which time the proposals had been considered in full. On the basis of that discussion the Business Board recommended that the proposals from Applicants 2 and 3 be approved now and that it be noted that Applicants 1 and 4 had been asked to bring forward further detail about their proposals to enable a final approval decision.

It was resolved to:

- a) Approve Applicants 2 and 3;
- b) Note that Applicants 1 and 4 had been asked to bring forward further detail to enable a final approval decision.

336. GROWTH PROGRAMME UPDATE

Professor Neely commented that Growth Deal programme performance had been reviewed by the Business Board at its meeting on 25 March 2019. On the basis of this, the Combined Authority Board was recommended to note the position to 28 February 2019 for the Growth Deal and Growing Places Fund and agree to the submission of the Growth Deal monitoring report to Government to the end of Quarter 3 2018/19.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the accumulative and in-year programme position to 28 February 2019 for Growth Deal and Growing Places Fund.
- b) Agree the submission of the Growth Deal monitoring report to Government to end Q3 2018/19.

337. ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK

Ms Sawyer, Interim Joint Chief Executive, stated that the Assurance Framework complemented the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework considered earlier in the meeting (minute 334 refers). It reflected the Government's revised National Local Growth Assurance Framework for Mayoral Combined Authorities with a Single Pot and Local Enterprise Partnerships and was designed to ensure openness and transparency in reporting to Government. The report had been submitted to the Business Board meeting on 25 March 2019.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Agree the revised single Assurance Framework which is in line with the Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government's revised National Local Growth Assurance Framework for Mayoral Combined Authorities with a Single Pot and Local Enterprise Partnerships.

338. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR BRIDGET SMITH

Councillor Smith welcomed the confirmation earlier in the meeting of the continued appointment of a full-time Scrutiny Officer to support the work of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (minute 321 refers). She judged that it was important that this arrangement continued in perpetuity as the Overview and Scrutiny Committee added significant value to the Combined Authority.

In seconding the Motion, Councillor Herbert commented that in his experience Scrutiny Committees significantly improved decision-making. He welcomed the decision to invite the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to undertake work on the CAM Metro project, but felt that the exempt appendix to the report should also have been shared with the Committee. Whilst the Combined Authority did not operate a pre-decision scrutiny model he did see scope to involve the Committee in multi-year projects of this type.

Councillor Count commented that he accepted the well-meaning intent behind the Motion, but there was a need to be careful to ensure that Scrutiny's work added value. At Fenland District Council a pre-decision scrutiny model worked well, but in the early days of the Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership (GCP) there had been significant clashes between the Scrutiny Committee and the Board which had taken a long time to resolve. It was in the knowledge of these experiences that arrangements at the Combined Authority had been produced. Councillor Count noted that the Constitution stated that members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee were entitled to a copy of any document which contained material relating to any business that had been transacted at a meeting of a decision-making body of the authority or any decision that had been made by an individual Member of the Combined Authority. The use of the past tense made clear that a pre-decision scrutiny role was not envisaged. He was not minded to reconsider this yet as he judged that the organisation was not yet mature enough to sustain a pre-scrutiny model.

Councillor Smith commented that she had submitted the Motion in the full knowledge that it would be rejected by some members of the Board. However, she felt it was an important discussion to have and one which she intended to revisit at appropriate intervals. She did not share Councillor Count's recollection of the relationship between the Scrutiny Committee and the Executive in the early days of the GCP. Rather, she judged that the early challenge provided by Scrutiny had helped shape the GCP into an open and engaged organisation to be proud of. Councillor Smith thanked Councillor Roberts for his offer to second the Motion if she would delete the last sentence which

would allow the Overview and Scrutiny Committee sight of Board reports prior to publication. However, whilst she would not expect the early release of all reports she remained of the view that it should be the case in relation to work which the Committee had been asked to undertake.

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

339. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Mayor stated that the meeting on 24 April 2019 had been cancelled so the Board would meet next for its Annual General Meeting on Wednesday 29 May 2019 in the Council Chamber, The Grange, Nutholt Lane, Ely, CB7 4EE

(Mayor)

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question
1.	Councillor Graham Wilson	Mayor James Palmer	<p>I am Graham Wilson, a Godmanchester Town Cllr and the County Cllr for Godmanchester.</p> <p>My question concerns agenda item 4.6 - Huntingdon Third River Crossing.</p> <p>A road to serve the development at Wyton Airfield across the Ouse Valley from the A141 to the A14/A1198 junction was considered during the preparation of the Huntingdon and Godmanchester Market Town Transport Strategy. However it was rejected, primarily due to the environmental damage it would cause. Instead a note was added in the document saying "Wyton Airfield Access - Further measures (to be determined by additional study work) to identify the most sustainable way to provide for the anticipated transport demand from the development of Wyton Airfield, and mitigate impacts on St Ives, Huntingdon and surrounding villages."</p> <p>Please can you confirm that the feasibility study you are proposing will consider a full range of options encompassing the wider strategic transport network, not just alternative routes for a road across the river valley between Godmanchester and Hemingford Abbots, and that comprehensive stakeholder engagement will be undertaken on the specification and during the feasibility study?</p>
	Response from:	Response to:	Response
	Mayor James Palmer	Councillor Graham Wilson	<p>The Combined Authority has recently commissioned several transport studies, some of which directly impact on the study area. It is anticipated that the study on the extension of the M11 to the A47 will report a direct impact on the transport area should investment in that proposal come forwards. In addition, the Combined Authority wishes to commission this study so that all parties are able to have a full understanding of any scheme's wider impacts, and that this are able to inform future planning decisions beyond the 2036 Local Plan in a way that hitherto has not been possible. A stakeholder engagement plan is requested as part of the commission of the study.</p>

	Question from:	Question to:	
2.	Councillor Mrs Flanagan	Mayor James Palmer	Is the Combined Authority aware of the high landscape value of the Great Ouse Valley between Huntingdon and St Ives? And will the scope of the transport study include evaluation of the environmental impact and sustainability of a Third River Crossing in this area?
	Response from:	Response to:	Response
	Mayor James Palmer	Councillor Mrs Flanagan	Yes, the feasibility study will look at environmental concerns. Further environmental impact studies will be needed if the project progresses.
	Question from:	Question to:	
3.	John Thackray	Mayor James Palmer	<p>My name is John Thackray and I represent both the Great Ouse Valley Trust and Godmanchester in Bloom</p> <p>The Great Ouse Valley is a landscape of national importance because of its biodiversity and its exceptional landscape quality. As the towns and villages on either side of the valley become more urbanised the Great Ouse Valley has even greater significance as a place of beauty and tranquillity and for physical and mental health.</p> <p>Cambridgeshire has less “natural” landscape than almost any other English county. The value of this unspoilt environment to the identity of the district is vital. One of the key factors that attracts tourism and encourages hi tech industries to move their workforces to the area is the exceptional quality of life offered. The Great Ouse Valley is a major factor in the economic success of Cambridgeshire. It must continue to provide a unique green counterpoint to the new urbanisation.</p> <p>A road across the Ouse Valley was considered during the preparation of the Huntingdon and Godmanchester Market Town Transport Strategy but was rejected, primarily because of the great concern about the environmental damage that would result.</p>

			Will the Authority agree that the starting point of a feasibility study should be the exceptional value of the Great Ouse Valley landscape to the health and wellbeing of the people and the economic success of the county and will the Authority agree that the need for a third river crossing should not be presumed until the full range of transport options in relation to the new developments are considered and that full stakeholder consultation is carried out at an early stage?
	Response from:	Response to:	Response
	Mayor James Palmer	John Thackray	The need for a third river crossing will not be presumed, and the feasibility study and further studies, if required, will consider a range of options. Environmental constraints will be addressed in early stages. A stakeholder engagement plan is required as part of the commission of the study.
	Question from:	Question to:	Question
4.	Mal Schofield	Mayor James Palmer	<p>Agenda I Item 4.2 Cambridge Autonomous Metro Update</p> <p>"3.4. The strategic case for the CAM is founded upon the following key points:</p> <p>(a) Without a transformational transport intervention, to accelerate the delivery of more housing that is affordable, the Cambridge economy will go into decline from 2031</p> <p>(b) Current and emerging transport policies point to the requirement for high quality transport corridors to provide the required transport capacity and connectivity to support growth</p> <p>(c) The historic, highly constrained nature of the city centre landscape mean that an at-grade solution will not deliver the capacity, connectivity or reliability required to support growth (d) That the CAM supports the concept of the 30-minute city; the Combined Authority's commitment to connecting homes to jobs</p> <p>3.5. In summary, there is not another transport solution that can achieve the connectivity and overcome the constraints."</p>

Cambridge is already the core of a Travel to Work area of 450,000 Jobs compared with Milton Keynes - 250,000 and Peterborough 200,000 close to Bristol (500,000) and bigger than Oxford (370,000). **There is a serious and disturbing lack of modal shift data between census (2011,2021)*** that would help support the critical proposition highlighted above.

Question

Could the Authority please set aside funds to update the 2011 Travel to Work Census to date and support in future all growth forecasts with the relative impact upon modal shift?

Primary Mode of Travel

Year/Area	Car	Bike	Bus/Train	Total
2011 Cambridge*	19,000	18,000	7,000	44,000
2011 S Cambs*	50,000	6,000	6,500	62,500
2011 Total GCP*	69,000	24,000	13,500	106,500
* QS 701 EW				
2012 Cambridgeshire	171,000	27,000	22,000	220,000
2015 Cambridgeshire	184,000	38,000	22,000	244,000

Source 2012/2015 ONS Tables 2017. LI03. ASHE Table 11.

Response From:	Response to:	Response
Mayor James Palmer	Mal Schofield	The Combined Authority recognises the importance of having up to date information on which to take robust decisions. It will consider this once it has been determined how it would contribute to the development of the business cases across the transport portfolio.