



**GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP JOINT ASSEMBLY**

- 4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS JOINT ASSEMBLY MEETING 2 NOVEMBER 2017**

This page is left blank intentionally.

# Agenda Item 4

Appendix A to the minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership meeting 02 November 2017 – public questions and answers

No	Questioner	Question	Response
10a	Mike Mason	<p>I refer the joint assembly to Agenda Item 10 Appendices 1 and 3. The financial reporting arrangements for GCP are unsound in that there is no public confidence in the budgeting process, financial control or value for money spent. Table 2 leads one to suspect that the figures under columns “Actual to Date”, “Forecast Outturn” and “Forecast Variance” are optimistic guesswork.</p> <p>I ask, are the “Actual to Date” figures verifiable by means of invoices from suppliers or cross authority documented charges (e.g. LA Admin. Costs, line 8)?</p> <p>Are these costs clearly and unambiguously defined in the County Council public payments data?</p> <p>If so will GCP publish a definitive list of cost centres for all of its expenditure headings to ensure that there is a clear audit trail and public accountability?</p> <p>If it is accepted that the County is the “Accounting Body” then what are the arrangements for recording all income including S106 money, housing and other grants or contributions, within the County Council’s comprehensive income and expenditure statement (CIES) which forms part of its audited accounts?</p> <p>With regard to Appendix 3, I would question whether the recommendation to use GCP funds to support revenue budget income shortfall in one of its constituent authorities is either legal, or within the spirit of the grant award by HM Government?</p> <p>Furthermore are Assembly Members aware that the County Council is recording the City Deal/GCP Government Grant funding of £60M, to be received in future years 3,4,and 5, as “Useable Assets” in the third version of the 2016/17 Statement of Accounts?</p>	<p>I ask, are the “Actual to Date” figures verifiable by means of invoices from suppliers or cross authority documented charges (e.g. LA Admin. Costs, line 8)? <a href="#">Yes</a></p> <p>Are these costs clearly and unambiguously defined in the County Council public payments data? <a href="#">Yes – If above £500 they are detailed in the published payment data (which excluded salary costs and any data which is confidential).</a></p> <p>If so will GCP publish a definitive list of cost centres for all of its expenditure headings to ensure that there is a clear audit trail and public accountability? <a href="#">Yes (see appendix one in the third page of this document)</a></p> <p>If it is accepted that the County is the “Accounting Body” then what are the arrangements for recording all income including S106 money, housing and other grants or contributions, within the County Council’s comprehensive income and expenditure statement (CIES) which forms part of its audited accounts? <a href="#">The County Council is the accountable body of the £100m City Deal grant.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Regarding S106 income and capital grants/contributions with conditions attached, this is recorded within the Capital grants and contributions section of the Taxation and Non-Specific Grant Income section of the CIES at the point when income is applied to expenditure (as per the CIPFA Code of Practice). For capital grants/ contributions which have no conditions unmet, these are recognised in the CIES within the Capital grants and contributions section at the point at which the income is received. Revenue grants are credited to Taxation and Non-Specific Grant income or the relevant service directorate depending on the grant in question- please see page 70 of the published Statement of Accounts for example: <a href="https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/council/finance-and-budget/statement-of-accounts/">https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/council/finance-and-budget/statement-of-accounts/</a></a></p> <p>With regard to Appendix 3, I would question whether the recommendation to use GCP funds to support revenue budget income shortfall in one of its constituent authorities is either legal, or within the spirit of the grant award by HM Government? <a href="#">The proposal to remove the charge at the County Council owned park and ride sites is not a proposal to cover the shortfall in income of the County Council. The County Council has no operational need to remove the charge and therefore the GCP is working with the County Council in order to support the strategic outcomes of the GCP by increasing patronage of public transport from these sites. GCP is funded by City Deal Grant (which can be used for capital or revenue activities), New Homes Bonus (revenue), S106 (capital), and interest on balances (revenue).</a></p> <p>Furthermore are Assembly Members aware that the County Council is recording the City Deal/GCP Government Grant funding of £60M, to be received in future years 3,4,and 5, as “Useable Assets” in the third version of the 2016/17 Statement of Accounts? <a href="#">A £60m debtor has been recognised in the County Council’s Statement of Accounts for the £20m grant funding yet to be received in years 3, 4 and 5. The unused grant has been moved to the Capital Grants Unapplied Account as expenditure has not yet been incurred. The Capital Grants Unapplied Account forms part of the County Council’s Useable Reserves as per the CIPFA Code of Practice and was an approach agreed by the Council’s independent external auditors. The County Council will be spending the City Deal grant in future years as per the budgets agreed by the GCP.</a></p> <p>Page 36 of the published Statement of Accounts 2016-17 has more details on the 2016-17 accounting treatment: <a href="https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/council/finance-and-budget/statement-of-accounts/">https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/council/finance-and-budget/statement-of-accounts/</a></p>

10b	Cllr Susan van de Ven	<p>With a relatively modest investment, the Cambridge-Royston cycle scheme could be quickly completed, within the Greater Cambridge Partnership Tranche 1 timeframe.</p> <p>I am not here to set out the detailed case for the scheme – that has already been done many times over, and the fact that it is near completion, thanks to GCP support, speaks for itself.</p> <p>The question now is how to tackle the remaining Melbourn - Royston two-mile stretch, given that this geography straddles a county border. The route consists of a pedestrian/cycle path in Cambridgeshire and a pedestrian/cycle bridge beginning in Cambridgeshire and landing in Hertfordshire.</p> <p>This is a shovel ready project that would deliver significant economic benefits, and make a substantial contribution to reducing reliance on the private car for travel to key areas of employment in Cambridge and along the A10 corridor. It will maximise the benefits of the investments in this route already made by GCP and others – indeed the whole will be greater than the sum of its parts. Because it has the potential to be delivered within the existing GCP funding period, it can demonstrate real progress on innovative, economically led schemes to Government.</p> <p>Ideally the Melbourn-Royston link should be delivered in one go. However, the overall Cambridge-Royston scheme has been delivered in segments as funding has become available, and this pragmatic approach has produced results. Nevertheless, any cross-border scheme demands a collaborative approach, as the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough LEP indicated last December when it pledged financial support for the project. Royston sits within the LEP’s remit, unsurprisingly given Royston’s Cambridge-facing business orientation.</p> <p>That collaborative approach is now taking shape: four global companies that jointly employ thousands of workers in Royston and Melbourn have pledged financial support or made indicative pledges, totalling £120K. Hertfordshire County Council funded and completed the bridge feasibility study and have formally committed lifetime maintenance costs for the bridge, estimated at £580K. Last month, Royston Town Council voted unanimously to commit £30K toward bridge costs, matching the commitment made by AstraZeneca. AstraZeneca has also provided a £10K grant for vegetation maintenance along the whole of the Cambridge-Royston cycle route. The A10 Corridor Cycling Campaign, with many of its members cycling to work, has raised £1.5K in small donations toward bridge costs.</p> <p>As the owner of Melbourn Science Park said to the City Deal Board last year, the A10 Cambridge- Royston cycle scheme will not only alleviate pressures on Science Park parking, which is at capacity, but it will allow the Science Park to create more jobs. This is precisely down to a significantly greater take-up of cycling, not driving, to work.</p> <p>Job creation and sustainable transport links are the key drivers for GPC investment, and partnership is the defining approach. Therefore, I would like to ask for the Assembly’s support in proposing that the GPC commit necessary funds to complete the Cambridgeshire portion of this scheme, which amounts to approximately £2 million, and works with the LEP to ensure release of their pledged funds to deliver the whole scheme within the timescales I have noted here.</p> <p>This would be great win: win for residents, businesses, the GCP and the LEP.</p>	<p>We are really pleased to have been able to deliver this scheme as the first GCP scheme, and are really encouraged to hear all the positive feedback the scheme has generated.</p> <p>Given the opportunity the extension presents, I think it’s something members should be thinking about adding to the Future Investment Strategy for consideration under the transport workstream.</p>
-----	-----------------------	--	--

**Appendix One – Greater Cambridge Partnership Cost Centres**

<b>Cost centre</b>	<b>Cost centre description</b>
UC20000	City Deal - NHB Funding
UC20010	CD - Programme Central Co-ordination
UC20020	CD - Strategic Communications
UC20030	CD – Skills
UC20040	CD - Economic Assessment
UC20050	CD - Smart Cambridge
UC20070	CD – Housing
UC20092	CD - Affordable Housing
UC20093	CD - Intelligent Mobility
UC20094	Cambridgeshire County Council costs
UC20096	South Cambridgeshire District Council costs
UC21000	City Access - Core Programme
UC21010	City Access - Bus Improvements
UC21020	City Access - Cycling Provision
UC21030	City Access - Demand Management
UC21040	City Access - Engagement & Comms
UC21050	City Access - Parking Management
UC21060	City Access - Public Space and Air Quality
UC21070	City Access - Travel Planning
UC22000	Developing 12 cycling greenways
UC23000	Electric Vehicle Charging
UC23010	Travel Audit - South Station and biomedical campus
UC23020	Travel Hubs
UC23050	Cambridge Promotions
UC23060	Towards 2050
UC23070	City Centre spaces & movement
UC24000	Residents Parking implementation

<b>Project Group - Capital</b>	
3520	Histon Rd
3521	Milton Rd
3522	Chisholm Trail
3523	A428 to M11
3524	Programme management and early scheme development
3525	City Centre capacity improvements
3526	A1307
3527	Cross City Cycle improvements
3528	Western Orbital
3529	A10 North Study
3530	A10 Frog End

This page is left blank intentionally.