



Overview and Scrutiny Committee_ Decision Summary

Meeting: 12th February 2018

<http://cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/meetings/overview-and-scrutiny-committee/?date=2018-02-12>

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 Yeulett, Cllr Murphy and Cllr Mason.
2.	Declaration of Interests	There were no declarations of interest.
3.	Budget Consultation	<p>The Committee considered the budget report that would be discussed at the Combined Authority Board meeting on Wednesday 14th February.</p> <p>The Chair invited the Interim Chief Finance Officer and the Financial Project Officer to answer the committees questions; the following point were made during the discussion:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The members noted that the responses that had been received from some constituent councils were more of a plea for funding rather than an actual comment on the budget and that there were no responses from the business sector, despite

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
		<p>request being sent to the Chamber of Commerce and others through other routes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members felt that this budget was a historical budget rather than a forward-looking budget as it outlined figures that had already been approved by the Board. • Members felt it would be useful to see the budget for future years to be able to get a good understanding of the costs around individual projects. • Members were advised that the Combined Authority were working on and would be providing a Medium Term Financial Strategy in due course, which would provide the information for the budgets for future years. • The LEP budget was still to be brought to the Board for approval, it was envisioned that this would be brought back in March. There was a legal requirement for the Combined Authority to approve a balanced budget before the beginning of March which was why the two budgets had to be considered separately. • Members felt that some information regarding the LEP budget should have been included with the budget. • Members raised concern around the documentation and presentation of the budget report and felt the budget should have a more granular process to enable members to have a better understanding. The Chief Finance Officer advised that she would be happy to work with the scrutiny committee to provide more detailed information, and that the Medium Term Financial Strategy would provide further detail. • The committee raised concern around the visibility of the income streams and where money was currently being held by the Combined Authority. The officers advised that there is a current Treasury Management Strategy which was considered by the Audit and Governance Committee at their December meeting, and plans to develop this further as the current strategy is based on the Peterborough City Council model. Audit and Governance Committee had asked for this to be reconsidered and a paper would be brought back to the next Audit and Governance Committee meeting in March.

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members queried the £175m reserves figure for 2018/19 financial year, as it was felt that this did not reflect the available funding by identifying any ringfenced projects, and therefore that money was not freely available to spend on other projects. It was agreed that the report could be clearer and the MTFP would address this. • Cllr Nethsingha raised a concern about the mayors increasing expenses and asked for more detail to be provided around this. Officers advised this was only a notional figure. <p>Cllr Nethsingha proposed, seconded by Cllr Baigent that the committee recommend the following to the Board meeting on Wednesday 14th February 2018.</p> <p>‘The O&S Committee express their concern at the lack of detail made available in the budget papers as they are presented. The Committee expresses particular concern that the budget papers do not reflect the money committed to projects in future years, for example commitments made to Peterborough University. We welcome the commitment to produce a medium term financial plan and ask that this be produced as a matter of serious urgency.’</p> <p>The Committee unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Full detail of the discussion can be found in the minutes http://cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/assets/Overview-and-Scrutiny-Committee/Overview-and-Scrutiny-Draft-Minutes-12th-February-2018.pdf</p>
4.	Mass Rapid Transport Review – Terms of Reference	<p>The Committee received the report which outlined the points needed to consider the terms of reference for the Mass Rapid Transport review group.</p> <p>The Committee resolved to appoint the following membership for the task and finish group:</p> <p>Cllr Cantrill, Cllr French, Cllr Carter, Cllr Baigent, Cllr Riley (until May 2018).</p>

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
		<p>The Committee agreed to appoint Cllr Cantrill as Chairman for the Task and Finish Group.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Task and Finish Group should meet following the conclusion of the O&S Committee on the 26th February at Huntingdonshire District Council.</p>
5.	Date & Location of Next Meeting	The next meeting would be held at Huntingdonshire District Council on the 26 th February 2018.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee_ Decision Summary

Meeting: 26th February 2018

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting scheduled for the 26th February was cancelled as there was no business for the committee to discuss.

The Task and Finish Group set up to consider the Mass Rapid Transport met on the 26th February 2018 and agreed the following terms of reference, which will be brought back to the O&S Committee for approval on the 26th March 2018.

- 1) To review existing processes and the development of the MRT project to date
- 2) To ensure that the CAM fits within an integrated transport network: if the busway and park and ride are not to be promoted,
 - (a) would the passenger transport network function effectively and
 - (b) would it align with schemes being delivered by GCP?
- 3) To consider the decision making and consultation processes to arrive at a transport solution based upon the CAM
- 4) To examine this project within the Local Transport plan development and the development of the Bus Strategy.