

COUNCIL - WEDNESDAY, 13 DECEMBER 2017

Late Item(s)

**10. CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH COMBINED
AUTHORITY – NOVEMBER UPDATES**

Decision summaries for the November meetings of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee are attached for information.

This page is intentionally left blank



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

Member representatives

Meeting	Dates of Meeting	Representative
Overview and Scrutiny Committee	27 November 2017	
Combined Authority Board	29 November 2017	

The above meetings have taken place in November.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee – Monday 27 November 2017

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

Board meetings – Wednesday 29 November 2017

The Board met on Wednesday 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-27-november-2017/>

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

This page is intentionally left blank



Overview and Scrutiny Committee_ Decision Summary

Meeting: 27th 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.	Apologies	Apologies received from Cllr Carter, substituted by Cllr Bucknell.
2.	Declaration of Interests	There were no declarations of interest.
3.	Minutes of the 23rd October 2017	The minutes of the meeting held on Monday 23rd October were agreed as a correct record subject to the following amendments:- That the names of the Portfolio Holders should be included in the minutes. At point 4.2 a more precise description on what imbalance meant should be included as follows.

9

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
		<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> <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.	Interview – Portfolio Holder for Fiscal Planning	<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"> • 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. • 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 • The Portfolio Holder confirmed that Combined Authority is the guarantor for its own

Item	Topic	Decision [<i>None of the decisions below are key decisions</i>]
		<p data-bbox="898 193 2047 256">lending; not constituent councils and going forward it would be up to the lender to guarantee any loans. This may change in the future.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="853 304 2069 368">• The Treasury Management paper will outline any borrowing requirements and if there are any borrowing caps imposed this would be set out in the finance strategy. <li data-bbox="853 416 2069 480">• Project borrowing would most likely be project specific but the Portfolio holder could not rule out other funding streams being used. <li data-bbox="853 528 2024 632">• 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 data-bbox="853 679 2024 783">• 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 data-bbox="853 831 2069 967">• 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 data-bbox="853 1015 2024 1078">• 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 data-bbox="853 1126 2024 1190">• 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 data-bbox="853 1238 2024 1374">• 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 data-bbox="853 1422 2047 1453">• A further £76 m was provided to Combined Authority in last week's budget and as

7

∞

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
		<p>central government gained further trust in the Combined Authority further funding would be granted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rather than funding agreements being labeled 'Devolution Deals' more money would come from a continuous series of successful bids and grants.• 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.• 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.• £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.• 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.• 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.• There was no Mayoral precept predicted for the 2018/19 budget.• To date there had been no extra cost to the tax payer from the Combined Authority.

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
		<p>A full summary of the interview is in the minutes: http://cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/meetings/overview-and-scrutiny-committee-27-november-2017/?date=2017-11-27</p>
5.	Interview – Portfolio Holder for Tourism & Leisure	<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"> • 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. • The Bus Review would look at areas beyond the borders of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. • 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.
6.	Review of Combined Authority Agenda	<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</p>

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
		<p>Finance Officer. Currently all posts at the Combined Authority were occupied in some 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"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • Officer structures within each organisation needed to be joined up. • 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. • 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. • 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

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

This page is intentionally left blank



**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/>

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

1.5	Forward Plan	It was resolved to approve the Forward Plan of Executive Decisions dated 20 November 2017.
1.6	Membership of the Combined Authority – Amendments	<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>
Part 2 – Key Decisions		
2.1	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Strategic Bus Review	<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"> <input type="checkbox"/> Review the existing network and service – including its strengths and weaknesses;

- 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;
 - Assess franchising and other operational models – and their relevance and value to this area’
 - Consider transition arrangements for new, future operational models
- An important feature of the review will be engagement with all stakeholder groups across the area including bus providers and Local Authorities.

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

It was resolved to:

- a) Agree to undertake a Bus Review within the scope and terms of reference set out in this report.
- b) Agree a total budget allocation of £150,000 to undertake the Bus Review.
- 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.
- 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.

	Part 3 – Other Decisions	
3.1	Transport Update	<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"> 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; 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 c) Approve the draft Statutory Instrument (Appendix 1) enabling the Combined Authority to levy the upper tier authorities for delivery of the transport functions
3.2	Adult Education Budget Devolution: Transitional Arrangements and Resourcing	<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"> <input type="checkbox"/> the non-apprenticeship part of the Adult Skills Budget <input type="checkbox"/> community learning <input type="checkbox"/> discretionary learner support <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 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</p>

		<p>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"> (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; (b) Agree the Combined Authority's approach to working with the Department for Education during the proposed 'transitional' 2018/19 academic year; and (c) Agree £40,000 of extra resource to ensure that the Combined Authority was equipped to prepare for AEB devolution.
3.3	Appointment of Legal Counsel & Monitoring Officer, and Loan of Chief Executive	<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"> (a) appoint Kim Sawyer as Legal Counsel and Monitoring Officer, (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.
3.4	Budget Update Report – 2017-18	<p>Constituent members when agreeing to the establishment of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) considered the resource allocations from</p>

central government and the initial expenditure plans which have since been further developed. This report provides an update of the 2017/18 budget.

It was resolved to:

1. Note the budget updates as requested for approval in other Board reports on this meeting's agenda.
2. Note the budget update made under delegated authority as set out in paragraph 3.5.
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

Part 4 – Date of Next Meeting

4.1 Date of Next Meeting

It was resolved to note the date of the next meeting – Wednesday 20 December 2017 at 10.30 am in Committee Rooms 1 & 2, Cambridge City Council, Guildhall, Cambridge