



## Overview and Scrutiny Committee\_ Decision Summary

**Meeting:** 18<sup>th</sup> December

<http://cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/meetings/overview-and-scrutiny-committee-18-december-2017/?date=2017-12-18>

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 Hayward and Cllr Riley. Apologies received from Cllr Baigent, substituted by Cllr Sargeant.
2.	<b>Declaration of Interests</b>	There were no declarations of interest.
3.	<b>Minutes of the 27<sup>th</sup> November 2017</b>	The minutes of the meeting held on Monday 27 <sup>th</sup> November 2017 were agreed as a correct record.
4.	<b>Review of Combined Authority Board Agenda</b>	The Committee reviewed the agenda due to come to the Board on Wednesday 20 <sup>th</sup> December 2017.  The following points were raised during the discussion:-  Agenda item 2.4, Establishing a new stronger public and private sector partnership in

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
		<p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough was confidential as it related to matters about the Greater Cambridgeshire Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership (GCGP LEP) which was a private company. Therefore, the Chief Executive could not comment more than what was published in the public report.</p> <p>Subject to decisions taken at the GCGP LEP Board on Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> December 2017 the Combined Authority Board may decide to discuss the exempt report in the public part of the meeting.</p> <p>In response to questions about agenda item 2.1, Transport: Developing our Decision Making and delivery arrangements, the following points were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There were a number of options to consider as part of the strategic bus review to seek improvements in bus services. Some Combined Authorities had adopted the full franchising model while other had not pursued this model at all, for example the West Midlands CA. Other Combined Authorities have adopted a partnership model.</li> <li>• Where franchising models have been adopted it was done with significant public subsidy.</li> <li>• It would not be sensible to progress without further investigation into service needs and costs implications.</li> <li>• Earlier in the year it was agreed to commission a new transport plan which would start in January with the first strategic themes reported in May/June next year.</li> <li>• The report regarding the bus review was due to come to the Board in September/ October next year and it would be requested that a timetable for the project be included in that report.</li> <li>• The report was constructed in conjunction with Peterborough City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council and co-developed by officers at both authorities.</li> <li>• The Overview and Scrutiny Committee would be consultees for the Local Transport Plan.</li> <li>• All transport functions had gone back to Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough</li> </ul>

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
		<p>City Council; and those councils are going through their usual budget plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In regard to funding for next year, some funding would come from government, and some from the councils to pass up to the Combined Authority. The Combined Authority will need to decide how to meet any shortfall.</li> </ul> <p>The Committee agreed that the Chairman should raise the following questions at the Board meeting on Wednesday 20th December on behalf of the Committee:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Could the Board clarify who had control of the transport budget, if the budget had been devolved to the County Council and Peterborough City Council were the Board aware of options under consideration for the removal of certain subsidies?</li> <li>2) Clarity was sought on what the funding figures quoted referred to, did they include home to school transport?</li> <li>3) The Committee requested assurance that they would have the opportunity to pre scrutinise integrated planning in advance of the May/June meeting.</li> </ol> <p>In response to questions about agenda item 2.2, Establishing the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Land Commission, the following points were made:</p> <p>Concerns were expressed about the relationship between Combined Authority and Local Plans, Cllr Yeulett advised the Committee that he had had a meeting with Cllr Herbert who had assured him that the local plans were sovereign.</p> <p>Cllr French suggested that Neighbourhood Plans should also be taken into account.</p>
5.	<b>Key Priority Themes</b>	<p>The report asked the Committee to consider whether they would like to continue with the Shadow Portfolio Holders system that was agreed at the June Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting or move to a thematic based system to be applied to the work programme.</p> <p>The Committee agreed to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) change to a system where members would cover key priority themes.</li> </ol>

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
		<p>(b) notify the Combined Authority Board of the change in approach</p> <p>(c) the allocations set out in appendix B of the report but that this allocation would be flexible.</p>
6.	<b>Overview &amp; Scrutiny Work Programme</b>	<p>The Committee received the report which provided the Committee with the draft work programme for the Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the 2017/18 municipal year and asked them for comments and suggestions.</p> <p>Committee members raised the following points during the discussion:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Monitoring Officer advised that the Committee did not need to follow the advice that had been provided. The Committee could invite anybody who provided a service to the Combined Authority but the committee cannot force them to attend.</li> <li>• Some members felt the remit was wider than just organisations that work with the Combined Authority.</li> <li>• Other Combined Authorities invited external organisations.</li> <li>• The Committee should be able to meet with people who have influenced the reports coming to the Board.</li> <li>• It was unacceptable that they could only consider items that were coming to the Board for consideration.</li> </ul> <p>The Monitoring Officer responded to the committee to advise that the terms of reference for the committee differed to those of a local authority scrutiny committee and further clarification was being sought from the Centre for Public Scrutiny about this.</p> <p>It was important to understand what the purpose of any review was and why external organisations were being invited to attend.</p> <p>Cllr Bradley put forward a motion that the Mayor be invited to attend the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting quarterly, this motion was seconded by Cllr Nethsingha.</p> <p>The motion carried unanimously.</p>
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-">http://cambridgeshirepeterborough-</a></p>

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
		<a href="http://ca.gov.uk/assets/Combined-Authority/Forward-Plan-updated-20-December-2017.pdf">ca.gov.uk/assets/Combined-Authority/Forward-Plan-updated-20-December-2017.pdf</a>
8.	<b>Date &amp; Location of Next Meeting</b>	The next meeting would be held at Cambridgeshire County Council on 29 <sup>th</sup> January 2018.