

# CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

## NOTICE OF MEETING

A meeting of the County Council will be held at Shire Hall, Castle Hill, Cambridge on Tuesday, 12th December 2017 at 10.30a.m.

---

### A G E N D A

---

Prayers led by the Reverend Matt Finch, Minister of St Ives Methodist Church

Apologies for Absence

1. Minutes – 17th October 2017 (previously circulated)
2. Chairman's Announcements (oral)
3. Declarations of Interests (oral)

*[Guidance for Councillors on declaring interests is available at <http://tinyurl.com/ccc-decoint>]*

4. Public Question Time (oral)

*To receive and respond to questions from members of the public in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9.3.*

5. Petitions (oral)

*To receive petitions from the public in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9.4.*

6. Item for Determination from General Purposes Committee

**Treasury Management Report Quarter 2** (oral)

To consider the following recommendation arising from the General Purposes Committee meeting on 28th November 2017 (minute 55 refers):

- a) Note the Treasury Management Report; and
- b) Forward to Full Council for approval.

*Note: a copy of the report discussed by the General Purposes Committee and the minutes of the meeting are available via the following link [General Purposes Committee meeting 28/11/2017](#)*

7. Appointments to Outside Organisations (page 6)
8. Motions submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10 (oral)

**(a) Motion from Councillor Peter Downes**

Council welcomes the government's intention to implement a national funding formula for the distribution of resources to schools.

Council notes that this formula will begin to address the issue of inequity in school funding but fails to do so as fully as anticipated.

Council welcomes the government's announcement that £1.3 billion over two years will be added to the quantum for schools.

Council notes however that this increase is not sufficient to compensate for the failure to fund inflation over the last 5 years and regrets the impact this is having on schools which are

- a. having to reduce the number of teachers
- b. narrowing the curriculum offer to students,
- c. restricting the support given to children with learning difficulties and
- d. finding it difficult to provide the equipment and materials needed for a 21<sup>st</sup> century education.

Council therefore calls on the Leader to write to the Secretary of State for Education drawing her attention to this motion and urging her to use whatever influence she has on the Chancellor of the Exchequer to increase the quantum available for education at the earliest opportunity.

*[The Monitoring Officer advises that the motion relates to a matter for the Council to determine and that the motion is therefore in order as drafted]*

**(b) Motion from Councillor Tom Sanderson**

Due to deductions for unsatisfactory performance under the Private Finance Initiative (PFI) contract for street lighting there is a forecast underspend of £384,000 in the budget.

This is due to the number of lights lit being less than the contractual requirement as well as lack of repairs and inspection.

This council wishes to express its disappointment at the unsatisfactory performance regarding street lighting and requests that a working party be established to allocate a percentage of the underspend to improve the quality and volume of lighting throughout the county.

*[The Monitoring Officer advises that the motion relates to a matter for the Council to determine and that the motion is therefore in order as drafted]*

**(c) Motion from Councillor David Jenkins**

Council recognises:

- the value of music education; and
- the excellent work done by Cambridgeshire Music in delivering it.

Council notes that:

- music education is not a statutory responsibility of the Council and that its cost needs to be balanced against the revenues which Cambridgeshire Music earns and grants which it can secure against its social benefit.

Council further notes that:

- the CREATE project has been developed to enable young people to have access to digital music opportunities throughout Cambridgeshire via centres in or close to Cambridge, Huntingdon and Wisbech; and
- earlier this year General Purposes Committee asked that a members' reference group be set up to oversee progress (with respect to the CREATE digital music project) and act as a steering group driving outcomes

Council therefore asks that

- the members' reference group be set up to consider the future strategy of Cambridgeshire Music (including options for the development and implementation of the CREATE project); and
- this group reports back to the Children & Young People Committee before 31 March 2018.

*[The Monitoring Officer advises that the motion relates to a matter for the Council to determine and that the motion is therefore in order as drafted]*

**(d) Motion from Councillor Elisa Meschini**

This Council notes that:

- For most workers in local government and schools, pay and other terms and conditions are determined by the National Joint Council (NJC) for local government services.

- On average, across the country, NJC basic pay has fallen by 21% in real terms since 2010.
- NJC workers have had a three year pay freeze from 2010-2012 and have received only 1% pay increase annually since then.
- NJC pay is the lowest in the public sector.
- Differentials in pay grades are being squeezed and distorted by bottom loaded NJC pay settlements needed to reflect the increased statutory national living wage.
- The likelihood of rising inflation following the vote to leave the European Union will worsen the current public sector pay inequality.

This council therefore supports the NJC pay claim for 2018, submitted by Unite, Unison and the GMB on behalf of council and school workers and calls for the immediate end of public sector pay restraint. NJC pay cannot be allowed to fall further behind other parts of the public sector.

This council also welcomes the joint review of the NJC pay spine to remedy the turbulence caused by bottom loaded pay settlements.

This council further notes the drastic ongoing cuts to local government funding and calls on the Government to provide additional resources to ensure all local authorities can fund a decent pay rise for NJC employees and the pay spine review.

This council resolves to ask the Chief Executive:

- To write to the Local Government Association (LGA) asking to make urgent representations to Government to fund the NJC claim and the pay spine review.
- To write to the Prime Minister and Chancellor supporting the NJC pay claim and seeking additional resources needed to fund a decent pay rise and the pay spine review.
- To write to local NJC union representatives to convey support for the pay claim and the pay spine review.

*[The Monitoring Officer advises that the motion relates to a matter for the Council to determine and that the motion is therefore in order as drafted]*

9. Questions:

(a) **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and Overview and Scrutiny Committee** (Council Procedure Rule 9.1) (pages 7 - 31)

(b) **Written Questions** (Council Procedure Rule 9.2) (oral)

To note responses to written questions from Councillors submitted under Council Procedure Rule 9.2.

Dated 4th December 2017



Quentin Baker  
Director of LGSS Law  
and Governance  
& Monitoring Officer

*The County Council is committed to open government and members of the public are welcome to attend this meeting. It supports the principle of transparency and encourages filming, recording and taking photographs at meetings that are open to the public. It also welcomes the use of social networking and micro-blogging websites (such as Twitter and Facebook) to communicate with people about what is happening, as it happens. These arrangements operate in accordance with a protocol agreed by the Chairman of the Council and political Group Leaders which can be accessed via the following link or made available on request:*  
<http://tinyurl.com/ccf-film-record>

*The Council cannot provide car parking on the Shire Hall site so you will need to use nearby public car parks. Details of other transport options are available on the Council's website at: <http://tinyurl.com/ccf-carpark>*

*For more information about this meeting, including access arrangements and facilities for people with disabilities, please contact Michelle Rowe at the County Council's Democratic Services on Cambridge (01223) 699180 or by email at: [michelle.rowe@cambridgeshire.gov.uk](mailto:michelle.rowe@cambridgeshire.gov.uk)*

**CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES: COUNTY COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS**

NAME OF BODY	MEETINGS PER ANNUM	REPS APPOINTED	REPRESENTATIVE(S)	CONTACT DETAILS
<b>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority</b>	3	13	<b>Councillor Michael Shellens replaces Councillor Lucy Nethsingha</b>	Democratic Services Room 117 Shire Hall Cambridge CB3 0AP

## **Agenda Item No.9(a)**

### **Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority Reports from Constituent Council Representatives on the Combined Authority**

#### **Member representatives**

<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Dates of Meeting</b>	<b>Representative</b>
<b>Overview and Scrutiny Committee</b>	<b>23 October 2017 27 November 2017</b>	<b>Councillor Jan French Councillor Lucy Nethsingha</b>
<b>Combined Authority Board</b>	<b>25 October 2017 29 November 2017</b>	<b>Councillor Steve Count</b>

The above meetings have taken place in October and November.

#### **Overview and Scrutiny Committee –Monday 23 October and 27 November 2017**

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee met on Monday 23 October and 27 November 2017. A summary of the committee's minutes is attached at **Appendix 1**.

#### **Board meetings – Wednesday 25 October and 29 November 2017**

The Board met on Wednesday 25 October and 29 November 2017 and the decision summaries are attached at **Appendix 2**.

The agendas and minutes of the meetings are on the Combined Authority website:

<http://cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/meetings/overview-and-scrutiny-committee-23-october-2017/>

<http://cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/meetings/overview-and-scrutiny-committee-27-november-2017/>

<http://cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/meetings/combined-authority-board-25-october-2017/>

<http://cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/meetings/combined-authority-board-29-november-2017/>



## Overview and Scrutiny Committee - Decision Summary

**Meeting:** 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2017

<http://cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/meetings/overview-and-scrutiny-committee-23-october-2017/?date=2017-10-23>

Chair: Cllr John Batchelor

Summary of decisions taken at this meeting

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
1.	<b>Apologies</b>	Apologies received from Cllr Nethsingha, substituted by Cllr Jenkins and apologies received from Cllr French.
2.	<b>Declaration of Interests</b>	There were no declarations of interest.
3.	<b>Minutes of the 21<sup>st</sup> September 2017</b>	The minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 21st September 2017 were agreed as a correct record.
4.	<b>Interview – Deputy Mayor and Portfolio Holder for Economic Strategy</b>	The Committee invited the Deputy Mayor and Portfolio Holder for Economic Strategy to the meeting to give a presentation and answer questions from the committee on his portfolio.



Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
		<p>Below is a summary of some of the points raised during the discussion:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In comparison to other EU countries such as Germany the UK was falling short in terms of economic growth despite there being areas of world class industry that needed to be expanded.</li> <li>• The Cambridgeshire economy was one of the fastest growing economies in the country but there was an imbalance within the area that need to be looked at.</li> <li>• The Independent Economic Commission had been established which would advise the Combined Authority on possible investments and interventions – these would form part of any business case being put forward for the Combined Authority.</li> <li>• The Portfolio Holder stated that he was confident that there would be substantial growth in all areas but that the Combined Authority needed to be clever with its interventions to ensure all areas experienced the growth.</li> <li>• The Combined Authority's 100-day plan had been completed and was available to view on the website. The 4-year plan and 20-year plan were being worked on and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee would be involved in the consultation process. The 20 Year Plan would be a visionary plan for the authority; the 4 Year Plan would be more of a road map.</li> </ul> <p>The Committee members raised many questions regarding the recent situation with the LEP; the Portfolio Holder gave the following responses to the questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Portfolio Holder advised the committee that the funding for the LEP had been put on hold by central government as they had not met the new requirements outlined in the assurance framework of the Combined Authority.</li> <li>• The Combined Authority would want the LEP to remain independent, with an independent Chair and Board but there would be value in looking at shared back</li> </ul>

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
		<p>offices and management and the use of one economic pot. This proposal is being considered by the LEP with a study group with four members from the LEP and four from the Combined Authority looking into it.</p> <p>A full summary of the interview is in the minutes: <a href="http://cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/meetings/overview-and-scrutiny-committee-23-october-2017/?date=2017-10-23">http://cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/meetings/overview-and-scrutiny-committee-23-october-2017/?date=2017-10-23</a></p>
5.	<b>Interview – Portfolio Holder for Employment and Skills</b>	<p>The Committee invited the Portfolio Holder for Employment and Skills to the meeting to give a presentation and answer questions from the committee on his portfolio.</p> <p>Below is a summary of some of the points raised during the discussion:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The provision of skills was a national issue; there had been confusion since 1945 with many Acts of parliament being passed to attempt to resolve the problem but it remained a complex issue.</li> <li>• There were three key areas of skills shortages in Cambridgeshire; construction, life sciences and health and social care but there could not be a blanket approach to dealing with all of these.</li> <li>• It was important that there was one voice that spoke to central government when it came to skills and Combined Authority could play a role here. There were currently no plans to work with the LEP on skills.</li> <li>• The challenge would be to create jobs that were attractive enough to retain those that had moved to the area for training.</li> <li>• There were projects within Cambridge that had worked well; the AGE Grant had created 500 apprenticeships in SME's.</li> <li>• The funding for the accommodation of the 2000 students at Peterborough University would be included in the second tranche of bidding, these students were</li> </ul>

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
		<p>expected by 2020. Providing temporary accommodation in the interim would be looked into. The estimated figure of achieving 2000 students at the Peterborough University by 2020 had been revised to 3000 students by 2022.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The £60m quoted for the University of Peterborough was a headline figure as the Combined Authority was at the beginning of a journey which would look at many different funding options for skills. Phase 1 had been taken forward by the LEP and Phase 2 would be taken forward by the Combined Authority.</li> <li>• There was an investment subcommittee that sat within the University of Peterborough Steering group which looked at mapping out the financial requirements and suggested where funding might come from.</li> <li>• The University of Peterborough would fill a lot of the areas of need within skills but it was a key priority that the Combined Authority did not just hand over money; it had to ensure that the schemes invested in were value for money.</li> <li>• It was important for the Combined Authority to act as a coordinator to all the different skills projects already in existence to bring together the fragmented areas and encourage them to work together.</li> </ul> <p>A full summary of the interview is in the minutes: <a href="http://cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/meetings/overview-and-scrutiny-committee-23-october-2017/?date=2017-10-23">http://cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/meetings/overview-and-scrutiny-committee-23-october-2017/?date=2017-10-23</a></p>
6.	<b>Review of Combined Authority Agenda</b>	<p>The Committee considered the agenda that had been published for the upcoming Combined Authority Board meeting on 25<sup>th</sup> October.</p> <p>The following points were made:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cllr Hayward advised that level crossings on the A1 were not mentioned in the Priority Transport Schemes report going to the Board meeting.</li> </ul>

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Chairperson raised an issue around the report going to the Board about Funding Requests for the LEP and that there was no indication of the risks or how money would be re-paid. The Committee were advised by the Interim Legal Counsel and Monitoring Officer that the three projects in question were key projects for the Combined Authority and underwriting the funds would allow these important projects to move ahead. The funding would be paid directly from the Combined Authority to the projects and officers were confident that the money would be repaid.</li> <li>• In response to a question about the timescales for the consultation on the budget the committee were informed that this was the first substantive budget for the Combined Authority, the timescales were tight and were dictated by central government but the consultation would only be necessary if the Combined Authority chose to introduce a levy or the Mayor decided to have a precept. There were currently no plans to introduce a levy or a precept.</li> </ul>
7.	<b>Combined Authority Forward Plan</b>	<p>The Committee noted the forward plan of the Combined Authority Board.</p> <p>The current forward plan is at <a href="http://cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/assets/Combined-Authority/Forward-Plan-updated-1st-November-2017.pdf">http://cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/assets/Combined-Authority/Forward-Plan-updated-1st-November-2017.pdf</a></p>
8.	<b>Overview &amp; Scrutiny Work Programme</b>	<p>The Committee agreed to amend the work programme to include the following point:-</p> <p>The Committee members requested that they submit their questions to the Portfolio Holders one day earlier than usual to allow the responses to be sent around by email the Friday before the meeting.</p>
9.	<b>Date &amp; Location of Next Meeting</b>	<p>The next meeting would be held at South Cambs District Council 27<sup>th</sup> November 2017 at 10am followed by a training session from the CFPS for committee members and substitutes.</p>

## Overview and Scrutiny Committee-Decision Summary

**Meeting:** 27<sup>th</sup> November 2017

<http://cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/meetings/overview-and-scrutiny-committee-27-november-2017/?date=2017-11-27>

Chair: Cllr John Batchelor

Summary of decisions taken at this meeting

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
1.	<b>Apologies</b>	Apologies received from Cllr Carter, substituted by Cllr Bucknell.
2.	<b>Declaration of Interests</b>	There were no declarations of interest.
3.	<b>Minutes of the 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2017</b>	<p>The minutes of the meeting held on Monday 23<sup>rd</sup> October were agreed as a correct record subject to the following amendments:-</p> <p>That the names of the Portfolio Holders should be included in the minutes.</p> <p>At point 4.2 a more precise description on what imbalance meant should be included as follows.</p> <p>The committee wished it to be recorded that their interpretation of the word “imbalance” used by the Portfolio Holder meant “That within the combined authority area there was a financial imbalance between different parts of the combined authority area and some areas were more disadvantaged than others.</p>

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
		<p>Under item 5 the committee asked for it to be recorded that the Portfolio Holder for Skills had advised that there would be no ‘mickey mouse’ degrees available at Peterborough University.</p> <p>At point 6.2 Cllr Hayward asked for it to be recorded that he did not say that level crossings were on the A1 and that he had requested that his point should be raised at the October Board meeting.</p> <p>The Committee requested that when presentation slides were sent out to members that they be presented one slide per page.</p> <p>In relation to matters arising, Cllr Murphy advised that at the last meeting that the S151 officer had agreed to provide information on the £3.8m available for transport in relation to the Rhubarb Bridge crossing. Cllr Murphy was still awaiting this information.</p>
4.	<b>Interview – Portfolio Holder for Fiscal Planning</b>	<p>The Committee invited the Portfolio Holder for Fiscal Planning (Cllr Steve Count) to the meeting to give a presentation and answer questions from the committee on his portfolio.</p> <p>Below is a summary of some of the points raised during the discussion:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The £600m would not deliver all the schemes within the Combined Authority’s remit but the funding could be used to unlock further funding streams.</li> <li>• The LEP and Combined Authority are separate legal entities so there was no financial impact on the combined authority unless it chose to. The Combined Authority had chosen to fund some LEP schemes previously under the LEP’s portfolio under approval of the CEO and later ratified by the Board. There were no plans for the Combined Authority to bail out any other organisations</li> <li>• The Portfolio Holder confirmed that Combined Authority is the guarantor for its own lending; not constituent councils and going forward it would be up to the lender to guarantee any loans. This may change in the future.</li> <li>• The Treasury Management paper will outline any borrowing requirements and if</li> </ul>

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
		<p>there are any borrowing caps imposed this would be set out in the finance strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project borrowing would most likely be project specific but the Portfolio holder could not rule out other funding streams being used.</li> <li>• Land Value Capture was being looked into as a funding solution but discussions were ongoing with central government. It was important to get the infrastructure needed to build the communities.</li> <li>• The lack of VAT registration for the Combined Authority was not an immediate concern as government was aware of the necessity and legislation to implement this was being sped up. All back monies would be recoverable.</li> <li>• The transport funding that was given to the Combined Authority was handed down to Peterborough City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council in its entirety but ultimately the Combined Authority was the transport authority for the area so it required the facility to levy in future.</li> <li>• The £2m funding promised in the budget last week would be paid over two years and would fund the staffing for the Combined Authority.</li> <li>• There would be no impact on constituent councils for funding and no constituent council had been asked for funding from the Combined Authority at this point.</li> <li>• The £20m per year for the next 30 years promised by government for the Combined Authority would be devalued over the years due to rising inflation and this was one of the reasons it was important to be looking at possible borrowing avenues now.</li> <li>• A further £76 m was provided to Combined Authority in last week's budget and as central government gained further trust in the Combined Authority further funding would be granted.</li> </ul>

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rather than funding agreements being labeled 'Devolution Deals' more money would come from a continuous series of successful bids and grants.</li> <li>• Options were being developed to allocate the £100m funding for housing development. The options would be based on assessed need using a robust criteria and business case. Consultants would be selected using similar criteria used by the County Council and an assurance framework.</li> <li>• The assurance framework stated that the £70m for housing development in Cambridge must be spent within the framework and it must be evidenced, however, Cambridge City Council would have direct control over the allocation.</li> <li>• £100m to deliver affordable housing can be used on viable sites across the combined authority area including stalled sites which could help with the housing shortage. Funding would be subject to viable individual business cases. It is written in to the assurance framework that should the Board feel that there was a need for them to intervene in an individual business case then they could. Procurements rules must be followed.</li> <li>• Project appraisal would be done using the budget method with each project being evaluated individually by the Combined Authority. The appraisal on priorities for the area covered by the Combined Authority would be done by the Economic Commission that had been set up. Some items would need independent guidance.</li> <li>• There were two mechanisms by which the Combined Authority could levy money; the first was through the Mayor's precept which could be used solely to fund the Mayor's own office. Secondly the Combined Authority could have a levy on business rates.</li> <li>• There was no Mayoral precept predicted for the 2018/19 budget.</li> <li>• To date there had been no extra cost to the tax payer from the Combined Authority.</li> </ul> <p>A full summary of the interview is in the minutes: <a href="http://cambridgeshirepeterborough-">http://cambridgeshirepeterborough-</a></p>



Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
		<a href="http://ca.gov.uk/meetings/overview-and-scrutiny-committee-27-november-2017/?date=2017-11-27">ca.gov.uk/meetings/overview-and-scrutiny-committee-27-november-2017/?date=2017-11-27</a>
5.	<b>Interview – Portfolio Holder for Tourism &amp; Leisure</b>	<p>The Committee invited the Portfolio Holder for Tourism and Leisure (Cllr John Holdich) to the meeting to give a presentation and answer questions from the committee on his portfolio.</p> <p>Below is a summary of some of the points raised during the discussion:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Authority to undertake a Bus Review was going to the Board on 29 November. The review would consider areas such as service on demand, transport to smaller towns and isolation in rural areas especially as it could feed into other schemes. With transportation being seen as a solution to isolation.</li> <li>• The Bus Review would look at areas beyond the borders of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.</li> <li>• The Combined Authority could encourage better management of the Public Rights of Way and this would be an area for the portfolio to look at.</li> </ul>
6.	<b>Review of Combined Authority Agenda</b>	<p>The Committee reviewed the upcoming agenda for the Combined Authority Board, the responses below were provided to the committees questions:-</p> <p>In response to a question about the St Neots item coming to the Board the CEO advised that St Neots was an underperforming area that had great potential and although different in many ways to other market towns in the area there would definitely be some similarities that could be transferred across areas.</p> <p>In response to a question about recruitment at the Combined Authority the CEO responded that the Combined Authority would be confirming the appointment of the Legal and Monitoring Officer on 29 November and would be starting recruitment for the Chief Finance Officer. Currently all posts at the Combined Authority were occupied in some</p>

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
		<p>capacity. The CEO planned to wait for a resolution with the LEP before making further permanent appointments.</p> <p>The CEO provided the Committee with a general update on the situation with the LEP, the following points were made:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The first priority for the CEO was to gauge the financial position of the LEP; with agreement from the LEP Board there were some actions that could be taken which would help to relieve some of the financial pressures.</li> <li>• The CEO had commissioned an independent financial review to be done by Grant Thornton and through the Chair of the LEP an independent review of how the LEP Board operates by Pinsent Masons.</li> <li>• The CEO stated that he felt that although the Combined Authority and the LEP were two separate entities, his role as CEO was one role - to achieve growth in the local economy and he was clear on what he was doing in each role.</li> <li>• Officer structures within each organisation needed to be joined up.</li> <li>• There was an opportunity for the LEP to become stronger and take on a more strategic role for the area; currently it was felt that the LEP was isolated, for example there were work projects being done by the LEP on skills that were also being looked at by other organisations. There was an opportunity to remove duplication.</li> <li>• The geographical areas covered by the LEP and the Combined Authority were different and this was a matter for the Board to consider, options would be brought back to Board.</li> <li>• The National Audit Office had completed a review into the LEP which would be published soon. This piece of work examined the governance of the LEP and was different to the two pieces of work that had been commissioned to be carried out by</li> </ul>

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
		Grant Thornton and Pinsent Mason.
7.	<b>Combined Authority Forward Plan</b>	The Committee noted the forward plan of the Combined Authority Board.  The current forward plan is at <a href="http://cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/assets/Combined-Authority/Forward-Plan-updated-20th-November-2017.pdf">http://cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/assets/Combined-Authority/Forward-Plan-updated-20th-November-2017.pdf</a>
8.	<b>Overview &amp; Scrutiny Work Programme</b>	The Committee agreed to discuss the work programme in more detail at their training session.
9.	<b>Date &amp; Location of Next Meeting</b>	The next meeting would be held at Fenland District Council at 2pm on the 18 <sup>th</sup> December 2017.



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE  
& PETERBOROUGH**  
COMBINED AUTHORITY

# CAMBRIDGESHIRE & PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY

## Decision Summary

Meeting: 25th October 2017

<http://cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/meetings/combined-authority-board-25-october-2017/>

Item	Topic	Decision
	<b>Part 1 – Governance Items</b>	
1.1	<b>Apologies and Declarations of Interest</b>	<p>Apologies received from Councillor Topping, substituted by Councillor Wright, Councillor Reynolds, substituted by Councillor Peach, and Jess Bawden.</p> <p>Councillors Count, Holdich and Howe declared non-statutory disclosable interests under the Code of Conduct in relation to Item 3.2, as members of the Local Enterprise Partnership Board. Councillor Holdich also declared a non-statutory disclosable interest under the Code of Conduct in relation to the same item, as a Director on Opportunity Peterborough appointed by Peterborough City Council;</p>
1.2	<b>Minutes – 27th September 2017</b>	It was resolved to approve the minutes of the meeting of 27th September 2017 as a correct record.
1.3	<b>Petitions</b>	None received.
1.4	<b>Public Questions</b>	None received.

Item	Topic	Decision
1.5	<b>Forward Plan</b>	<p>It was resolved to approve the Forward Plan of Executive Decisions dated 23 October 2017 subject to the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Items 12, 13 and 14 had been moved from November to the December meeting.</li> <li>- Adult Education Budget Devolution, and Transport update had been added to the November meeting</li> </ul>
	<b>Part 2 –Non Key Decision</b>	
2.1	<b>Market Town Masterplans: St Neots</b>	<p>The ten market towns of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, and the city of Ely, represent the places where much of the planned housing growth will occur over the next twenty years. They will be home to approximately a third of the population of the Combined Authority area. It is therefore hugely important that market towns thrive and are successful as prosperous economic centres, and are vibrant, great places to live. Previous economic strategies have not always recognised their role, nor has there been co-ordinated investment plans that enable them to achieve their full potential.</p> <p>St Neots was chosen by the Combined Authority as the starting point for a renewed focus on market towns, and the 100 Day Plan committed investment to develop a Masterplan. This report brought the first phase of the St Neots Masterplan to the Board. The key conclusion was that St Neots is a place that has great potential as a leading example of a thriving modern day market town, but this needed to be unlocked by creating an investment programme and a new partnership and delivery team.</p> <p>The Masterplan analysis concludes that from a coordinated programme of investments an additional £185m/annum Gross Value Added (GVA) will be created by the end of the plan period. The first stage of work had identified a package of £5.8m of early stage investments – these would enable future growth as well as make a real difference for the existing residents and visitors of St Neots.</p> <p>However, the forecast growth of GVA in St Neots of 40% falls well short of the Combined Authority goal to double GVA in all areas of the region. The strategic implication from this analysis was that our target to double Cambridgeshire and Peterborough’s GVA can only be met if the ceiling on new homes and new jobs, with related investments, was significantly increased.</p>

Item	Topic	Decision
		<p>It was considered essential to the development of future plans for St Neots that the A428 expressway and the rapid transit (light railway) system connecting St Neots with Cambridge were both commissioned and built by the early 2020s.</p> <p>It was resolved to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) welcome the analysis and findings of the first phase of the Masterplan for St Neots;</li> <li>b) endorse the development of the next phase of the Masterplan through the creation of a “St Neots Masterplan Partnership”;</li> <li>c) note that a total investment programme of up to £5.8m was needed to unlock the growth potential of St Neots within existing plans;</li> <li>d) request that officers work with the St Neots Masterplan Partnership to develop a business case for collective investment in the proposed programme, and bring forward investment proposals to this Board as part of that approach;</li> <li>e) establish that any proposals for Combined Authority investment that were brought forward were in line with the Authority’s Investment Strategy as set out in paragraph 3.8;</li> <li>f) note the intention to promote the development of masterplans for market towns in Cambridgeshire, as part of the Combined Authority’s wider economic strategy.</li> </ul>
	<b>Part 3 – Key Decision</b>	
3.1	Priority Transport Schemes	<p>The purpose of this report was to ask the Board to agree funding for the next tranche of priority transport schemes.</p> <p>These schemes would support the wider Combined Authority objectives by improving transport connectivity, reducing congestion, enabling housing growth and/or supporting economic growth.</p> <p>This report set out a longer term pipeline of work to ensure that there is a steady flow of transport interventions that are effectively planned and well considered over the current and</p>

Item	Topic	Decision
		<p>future Mayoral cycles. This longer term approach was vital to building confidence; developing and positioning projects for future private sector investment; and enabling accelerated delivery by providing delivery partners with visibility of future work.</p> <p>It should be noted that these schemes were in addition to the strategic transport and infrastructure schemes approved previously by the Board. The pipeline of schemes also excluded those projects currently being promoted, funded and/or developed independent of the Combined Authority. This included the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP), Highways England and Network Rail.</p> <p>It was resolved to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Agree a total budget allocation of £4.53m, comprising £3.53m in 17/18 and £1.0m in 18/19 for the rolling programme of priority transport and infrastructure schemes</li> <li>b) Note the intention to deliver this 4 year programme of priority transport and infrastructure schemes, and the indicative level of future investment.</li> <li>c) Note the governance and budget management arrangements, and the intention to bring the pipeline back to the Board on an annual basis. In the future it is intended to maintain and develop this programme beyond the current 4 year.</li> </ul>
	<b>Part 3 – Non Key Decision</b>	
3.2	Funding requests in place of Greater Cambridgeshire Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership	<p>This report highlighted urgent funding requests made by various bodies to the Combined Authority in place of grants which the Greater Cambridgeshire Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership (GCGP LEP) was not in a position to fund.</p> <p>It was resolved to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Note the urgent funding requests made by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The Independent Economic Commission</li> <li>ii. Opportunity Peterborough</li> </ul> </li> <li>(b) Note the funding approvals already given in relation to the Independent Economic</li> </ul>

Item	Topic	Decision
		<p>Commission and Opportunity Peterborough to ensure important priority objectives could be met.</p> <p>(c) Note that upon restoration of funding to the Greater Cambridgeshire Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership (GCGP LEP) the Combined Authority would make applications to the GCGP LEP Board to restore the funding position of the Combined Authority.</p>
	<b>Part 4 – Budget and Fiscal decisions</b>	
4.1	<b>Budget Preparation and Consultation Proposals</b>	<p>This report set out the proposed budget setting process for the approval of the Combined Authority's 2018/19 budget.</p> <p>It was resolved to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. approve the proposed timetable and the consultees to be involved in the consultation of the Combined Authority's budget 2018/19.</li> <li>2. Note the emerging strategic themes for the 2018/19 budget.</li> </ol>
4.2	<b>Budget Update</b>	<p>This report provided an update of the 2017/18 budget.</p> <p>It was resolved to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Note the budget updates as requested for approval in other Board reports on this meeting's agenda.</li> <li>2. Approve the use of interest receivable balances to cover committed additional support costs as set out in paragraph 3.6.</li> <li>3. Note the budget updates as requested for approval as set out for approval in paragraph 3.5.</li> <li>4. Approve funding of £30.6k for the contribution to phase 1 of the development of a National Evaluation Framework.</li> </ol>



Item	Topic	Decision
		5. Note the updated budget and indicative resources for 2017/18 and 2018/19 to 2020/21 as set out in Appendices A and B
	<b>Part 5 – Date of Next Meeting</b>	
5.1	<b>Date of Next Meeting</b>	It was resolved to note the date of the next meeting – Wednesday 29 November 2017 at 10.30am at South Cambridgeshire District Council, South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne Business Park, Cambourne, Cambridge CB23 6EA



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE  
& PETERBOROUGH**  
COMBINED AUTHORITY

# **CAMBRIDGESHIRE & PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY**

## **Decision Summary**

**Meeting:** 29th November 2017

<http://cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/meetings/combined-authority-board-29-november-2017/>

<b>Item</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Decision</b>
	<b>Part 1 – Governance Items</b>	
1.1	<b>Apologies and Declarations of Interest</b>	Apologies received from Councillor Holdich, substituted by Councillor Fitzgerald, and Councillor Topping, substituted by Councillor Nick Wright.
<b>Item</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Decision</b>
1.2	<b>Minutes – 27th September 2017</b>	It was resolved to approve the minutes of the meeting of 25th October 2017 as a correct record.
1.3	<b>Petitions</b>	None received.
1.4	<b>Public Questions</b>	None received.

1.5	<b>Forward Plan</b>	It was resolved to approve the Forward Plan of Executive Decisions dated 20 November 2017.
1.6	<b>Membership of the Combined Authority – Amendments</b>	<p>It was resolved to note the following appointments made by Huntingdonshire District Council for the remainder of the municipal year 2017/2018:</p> <p>(a) Councillor Graham Bull to replace Councillor Robin Howe as its Member to the Combined Authority;</p> <p>(b) Councillor Ryan Fuller as Councillor Graham Bull's substitute to the Combined Authority.</p> <p>The Board also noted that the Mayor had appointed Councillor Charles Roberts as his statutory Deputy Mayor.</p>
	<b>Part 2 – Key Decisions</b>	
2.1	<b>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Strategic Bus Review</b>	<p>The purpose of this report was to ask the Board to agree to a strategic review of bus services within the Combined Authority area.</p> <p>Buses have the potential to provide economic and social benefits by connecting people with jobs, shops and facilities; they can minimise social isolation; and can reduce congestion on some of our busiest roads. Many bus services are run successfully on a commercial basis but there are also a significant minority of services, particularly in rural areas and those provided for people with disabilities, which are only viable currently through public subsidy.</p> <p>Considerable work has already been undertaken to improve the operational efficiency of the existing bus service. However, significant further operational improvements are unlikely to be achieved using existing delivery models without considerable public sector subsidy. Such investment is likely to offer a diminishing return and is unlikely to deal with the underlying issues.</p> <p>This paper proposed that a strategic study is undertaken. It will:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Review the existing network and service – including its strengths and weaknesses;</li> <li>- Develop strategic options for bus services of the future – taking account of other strategic transport initiatives, so that any proposals can be seen as part of a whole transport solution. New technology and innovative solutions from across the UK and the world will also be considered;</li> <li>- Assess franchising and other operational models – and their relevance and value to this area'</li> <li>- Consider transition arrangements for new, future operational models</li> </ul> <p>An important feature of the review will be engagement with all stakeholder groups across the area including bus providers and Local Authorities.</p> <p>For the purpose of this report buses are defined as services that provide on road passenger transport provision either via a traditional bus or a smaller tailored accessible vehicle</p> <p>It was resolved to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Agree to undertake a Bus Review within the scope and terms of reference set out in this report.</li> <li>b) Agree a total budget allocation of £150,000 to undertake the Bus Review.</li> <li>c) Note the intention to use this Bus Review to inform a future Combined Authority Bus Strategy which would be developed as part of the future Local Transport Plan.</li> <li>d) Note that the Bus Review would seek to recognise the issues faced in certain areas of Cambridgeshire following the recent withdrawal of some commercial services.</li> </ul>
--	--	---

	Part 3 – Other Decisions	
3.1	<b>Transport Update</b>	<p>The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Order 2017 conferred the local transport planning powers on the Combined Authority creating the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority as the local transport authority.</p> <p>This report set out how transport functions are currently delivered; considered future delivery models; and requested the approval of a statutory instrument which enabled the Combined Authority to levy the upper tier authorities for the cost of delivering the transport functions. It was resolved to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Note that the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, as the local transport planning authority, delegated its transport powers and transport funding to Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council for 2017/18;</li> <li>b) Agree to report back to the Board in December on the implications of the Combined Authority assuming the decision making powers for strategic transport planning matters and the impact of that for the upper-tier authorities and other bodies</li> <li>c) Approve the draft Statutory Instrument (Appendix 1) enabling the Combined Authority to levy the upper tier authorities for delivery of the transport functions</li> </ul>
3.2	<b>Adult Education Budget Devolution: Transitional Arrangements and Resourcing</b>	<p>The devolution of the Adult Education Budget (AEB) represented a central component of the skills agenda for the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA). The AEB brings together what were previously three separate funding streams into a single budget, comprising of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the non-apprenticeship part of the Adult Skills Budget</li> <li>- community learning</li> <li>- discretionary learner support</li> </ul> <p>It has been suggested that successful localisation of this budget could allow the CPCA greater flexibility and responsiveness in addressing the region's skills needs.</p> <p>Although full devolution was originally scheduled for the 2018/19 academic year, it had become apparent that this was no longer feasible without substantial risks to learners and</p>

		<p>providers. Consequently, the Department for Education (DfE) had proposed two transitional options for the 2018/19 academic year before full devolution in 2019/20. The DfE has subsequently written to all Mayoral Combined Authorities requesting formal confirmation of their chosen transitional option. This paper detailed and contextualised the options available and recommended the basis for how CPCA work with the DfE during the 2018/19 academic year.</p> <p>To ensure that the CPCA was prepared for full devolution in 2019/20, a significant amount of preparatory work was required to satisfy the DfE's 'readiness criteria' for the transfer of AEB powers.</p> <p>The report also outlined the level of additional resource required to ensure that CPCA has the specialist knowledge and capacity to prepare for AEB devolution.</p> <p>It was resolved to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Note the steps taken to prepare the Combined Authority for full devolution of the Adult Education Budget in time for the 2019/20 academic year;</li> <li>(b) Agree the Combined Authority's approach to working with the Department for Education during the proposed 'transitional' 2018/19 academic year; and</li> <li>(c) Agree £40,000 of extra resource to ensure that the Combined Authority was equipped to prepare for AEB devolution.</li> </ul>
3.3	<b>Appointment of Legal Counsel &amp; Monitoring Officer, and Loan of Chief Executive</b>	<p>The purpose of this report was to ask the Board to appoint Kim Sawyer as Legal Counsel and Monitoring Officer following the recommendation of the Employment Committee.</p> <p>It was resolved to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) appoint Kim Sawyer as Legal Counsel and Monitoring Officer,</li> <li>(b) note that the Mayor had exercised his general power of competence on behalf of the Combined Authority to agree to loan the Chief Executive to the Greater Cambridgeshire Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership on a part time and interim basis.</li> </ul>

3.4	<b>Budget Update Report – 2017-18</b>	<p>Constituent members when agreeing to the establishment of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) considered the resource allocations from central government and the initial expenditure plans which have since been further developed. This report provides an update of the 2017/18 budget.</p> <p>It was resolved to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Note the budget updates as requested for approval in other Board reports on this meeting's agenda.</li> <li>2. Note the budget update made under delegated authority as set out in paragraph 3.5.</li> <li>3. Note the updated budget and indicative resources for 2017/18 and 2018/19 to 2020/21 as set out in Appendices A and B</li> </ol>
	<b>Part 4 – Date of Next Meeting</b>	
4.1	<b>Date of Next Meeting</b>	<p>It was resolved to note the date of the next meeting – Wednesday 20 December 2017 at 10.30 am in Committee Rooms 1 &amp; 2, Cambridge City Council, Guildhall, Cambridge</p>