



Overview and Scrutiny Committee_ Decision Summary

Meeting: 29th January 2018

<http://cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/meetings/overview-and-scrutiny-committee-29-january-2018/?date=2018-01-29>

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 French, no substitute.
2.	Declaration of Interests	There were no declarations of interest.
3.	Minutes of the 18th December 2017	The minutes of the meeting held on Monday 18 th December 2017 were agreed as a correct record.
4.	Rapid Mass Transport	The Committee received a presentation from the consultants Steer Davies Gleave The Chairman invited the committee to ask questions of the consultants, the Director of Transport and the Mayor of the Combined Authority. Below is a summary of the points raised,

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report released in December outlined the emerging findings from the study to get feedback. The current report reflected the final detail of the study; the report belonged to Steer Davies. • The report was putting forward a concept idea so there was not the detail around how much land may be required but it was acknowledged that land in Cambridge was expensive and highly sensitive. • There were a number of examples of the suggested technology being trialed and was being adopted in the UK. The technology would be available at the time. • It was recognized that some form of demand management would be required but what format this would take had not been considered other than recognising it would be needed. • The route was not set yet but the underground would be linked up like the London Underground system. New routes would be where there were significant routes already but further routes across the county could be considered. • Although the system was Cambridge centric it was key to getting people from one side of the city to the other side which would relieve congestion in the surrounding area around the city. • To ensure that the market towns were connected existing infrastructure such as rail stations would be used and interchanges would be created. • There existed an extraordinary economy across the county but there was increasing pressure on housing prices. There was a need to create growth by having a high-quality transport system, which would in turn create high quality market towns. • Highways England now consider other interventions from others that will alleviate traffic and reduce their costs however funding for the project was more likely to come from outside investors rather than from central government. • Funding would not come from a precept levied by the Mayor nor would local district councils be asked to contribute. • Finance would come from the private sector; elected Mayors could come up with solutions

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
		<p>for their own area and as Cambridgeshire has high land value if we can capture this it could be used for further financing of major projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This system could only be delivered by the Combined Authority. The system would go into so many areas of county that it must be Combined Authority project. Leaders of District Councils sit on the Board so there would always be input from those areas. To maintain the speed required for successful development we cannot go through different organisations. • Existing road developments and planning projects could be affected; some would continue others may need to change so they would CAM project and others may need to be dropped but a detailed study of this would need to be done. The Combined Authority would work with colleagues at GCP to identify the different schemes; this was an important piece of work over the coming months. <p>Full detail of the discussion can be found in the minutes http://cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/meetings/overview-and-scrutiny-committee-29-january-2018/?date=2018-01-29</p>
5.	Budget Consultation	<p>The Committee received the budget consultation from the Project Accountant to make any comments on.</p> <p>The Committee members raised concern that the budget consultation only contained two pages of information. The officer explained that the budget was made up of known expenditure and upcoming budget proposals.</p> <p>Cllr Murphy requested that a review of funding for housing in Peterborough was considered in the budget. Also, the member referred to Peterborough University; the City Council was looking at selling or leasing Bayard Place while the university project team were looking at accommodation so could the two organisations speak to each other.</p> <p>The LEP budget would be brought to the Board separately in March with both budgets being combined once the two organisations had become one. The budget had tried to reflect all major programmes and would cross reference the RMT budget as this was currently not reflected.</p> <p>The Committee agreed that they would like to hold an additional Overview and Scrutiny meeting before the additional Board meeting in February to scrutinise the budget and the consultation</p>

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
		results.
6.	Review of Combined Authority Board Agenda	<p>The Committee reviewed the agenda due to come to the Board on Wednesday 31st January 2018.</p> <p>Regarding the housing report members were advised that the paper with the next tranche of housing funding would come to the February Board meeting.</p> <p>In regard to the report on a ‘Stronger Public and Private Sector Partnership in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough’ the committee were advised that the Business Board would be a blend of business representatives and public-sector representatives but which organisations would be represented had yet to be decided. Once the Board was established it would be their decision as to who would sit on the Combined Authority Board to represent them.</p> <p>In regard to the different geography of the two organisations, the Mayor, deputy Mayor’s and the Chief Executive would be working with other authorities and central government to consider. This would be brought back to the Board to decide and allow for O&S to scrutinise if they wished.</p>
7.	Communities and Local Government Select Committee Report	<p>Members queried whether they could scrutinise the Mayor directly or only decisions of the Mayor made through the Board. The Monitoring Officer advised that under the order the Combined Authority has one role and the Mayor has a separate role, so the Mayor could make decisions separately although these could not be key decisions and would have fairly minor financial impact.</p> <p>The committee could look at the office of the Mayor but it would need to be focused and define exactly what they wanted to gain from scrutinising.</p> <p>Members raised concern around the amount of time the Board meetings went on for as in comparison to the O&S meeting they were very short.</p> <p>The Committee were advised that Board members were fully engaged with all reports prior to them being presented at the public meeting and that there was a robust debate between Board members.</p> <p>In regard to the RMT tender process the committee were advised that the Combined Authority needed to go through a procurement process. There was a framework that had been agreed to</p>

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
		select the current provider. The Combined Authority would return to the framework to select the new contract, the current consultant had considerable knowledge so it would be a cost saving by using the same consultant if they met the criteria set out in the framework.
8.	Overview & Scrutiny Work Programme Report	<p>The Committee received the report which provided the Committee with the draft work programme for the Overview & Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the 2017/18 municipal year and asked them for comments and suggestions.</p> <p>The Committee discussed the RMT report and whether the processes had been followed for the release of information and were advised that the law stated that supportive reports may come out late but must be published as soon as possible.</p> <p>The Committee agreed they would like to set up a review to consider the work around the Rapid Mass Transport, the terms of reference would be brought back to the additional meeting on the 12th February for the committee to consider and agree.</p>
9.	Combined Authority Forward Plan	<p>The Committee noted the forward plan of the Combined Authority Board.</p> <p>The current forward plan is at http://cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/assets/Combined-Authority/Forward-Plan-29-January-2018.pdf</p>
10.	Date & Location of Next Meeting	The next meeting would be held at East Cambridgeshire District Council on the 12 th February 2018.