



## Overview and Scrutiny Committee\_ Decision Summary

**Meeting:** 26<sup>th</sup> March 2018

<http://cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/meetings/overview-and-scrutiny-committee-26-march-2018/?date=2018-03-26>

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 Nethsingha
2.	<b>Declaration of Interests</b>	There were no declarations of interest.
3.	<b>Minutes</b>	The minutes from the meeting held on the 29 <sup>th</sup> January and the 12 <sup>th</sup> February were agreed as a correct record.
4.	<b>Combined Authority Board Agenda</b>	Mayor James Palmer for the Combined Authority attended the meeting to respond to questions in reference to the upcoming Combined Authority Board agenda.  The following points were made during the discussion:-  <u>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Strategic Spatial Framework (non-statutory)</u>

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Under the non-statutory spatial plan local plans will continue to have the same weight that they currently do.</li> <li>•Cllr Lewis Hebert was very keen to take on this portfolio and all decisions relating to this would be taken by the portfolio holder and the Mayor.</li> </ul> <p><u>Transport Delivery 2018/19</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The transport strategy was based on roads that could be delivered on; the A1 was not one of those. The Mayor had spoken to central government about the A1 and as it was linked to A1428 which was a priority. There was a lot of work to do across the county to try and make improvements where they could be made.</li> <li>•All schemes included in the transport strategy are bottom up; they were identified through the county council as well as the Combined Authority strategic views. If schemes were not captured then they were not in the system.</li> <li>•Schemes which would look at level crossings in the South West of the county could be brought forward in future years.</li> <li>•The Combined Authority received money for pothole repairs which had been allocated out to the respective highways teams, £970k addition for potholes.</li> <li>•The future delivery of the transport strategy would be looked at within the review into public sector reform.</li> <li>•A review of the bus strategy was being undertaken.</li> </ul> <p><u>Digital Connectivity Infrastructure: Improving Mobile Coverage and increasing the full fibre footprint across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•A government grant had been won to improve the broadband in the area and work was being done with other organisations such as City Fibre in Peterborough.</li> </ul>

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Improvement and investment in fibre broadband was important for the local economy – the needs of the local area and towns were changing, there was an opportunity in this change to create improvements.</li> </ul> <p><u>University of Peterborough – Interim Accommodation Options</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The accommodation for the university referred to the location of the university campus.</li> <li>•The new Peterborough University should be different to other universities and the courses offered should be built upon the existing needs for the area to provide high level education that would feed into the local economy, for example engineering, teacher training, life sciences, technology and agricultural technology were course that would be considered.</li> <li>•There was a lot of work still to be done on the university project; this report was to approve temporary facilities. A full business case would be brought to the Board in December which would outline the options for funding of large schemes such as this.</li> <li>•There would be independent gateway reviews undertaken for the large projects such as the university.</li> <li>•The Mayor stated that he fully backed option 3 in the report. The Mayor felt it was not the time to do something substandard; this investment would enhance the economy of the area. The other options would waste money as wouldn't deliver on what was required for the area.</li> <li>•The suggested site on embankment was the best spot as the university campus needed to be central.</li> </ul> <p><u>£70m Cambridge City Devolution Housing Programme</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The £70m ringfenced for Cambridge City – was money that the city would need to spend</li> </ul>

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
		<p>and therefore scrutiny of this would need to be carried out by the Cambridge City Housing Scrutiny Committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Accountability would rest with the Combined Authority.</li> <li>•Cambridge City and the Combined Authority would be giving assurance to government together.</li> </ul> <p><u>£100m Affordable Housing Programme</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Where the Combined Authority had utilised skills of other authorities there had been some bias rather than a full county view; the policies had to take into account both north and south issues.</li> <li>•The need for a committee system has come from issues around housing.</li> <li>•The way in which housing has been provided over the last 30 years had not worked – part of this was the reliance on housing associations.</li> <li>•Devolution was meant to help solve the problems on a local level by looking at different ways of delivering services such as housing.</li> <li>•Reliance on one existing entity had not proved to be sustainable so the challenge would be to work out what we should have instead – intention would be to bring forward proposal options for the Board to consider; one option could be to create a developer corporation.</li> <li>•There were problems in the current system; planning permission was not enough to get developers moving. A system which would open the markets to more players and create more competition would be key.</li> </ul> <p><u>East Cambridgeshire Strategic Community Land Trust (CLT) Programme – Provision of Loan Facility</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The Combined Authority were developing a full business case and gaining independent</li> </ul>

Item	Topic	Decision [ <i>None of the decisions below are key decisions</i> ]
		<p>advice on commerciality and modelling and were currently working on the commerciality points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The state aid issue had been addressed, the rate of interest had not been clarified yet but it was being worked on.</li> <li>•An external advisor had encouraged the Combined Authority to increase the amount of risk to increase our yield. The organisation was being far too risk adverse but officers would be looking at some security and asking ECDC to act as guarantors.</li> <li>•The Combined Authority had received technical advice on risk and had engaged Candor who had provided strong professional advice and discussion on the framing of the loan agreement between the Combined Authority and East Cambs Trading Company.</li> <li>•The Combined Authority had used a degree of professional support – the Combined Authority would be operating as a bank and would provide advice on how to use funds available to it. This was to create recyclable loans.</li> </ul> <p><u>Committee System</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•There is a proposal that will be brought forward to the Board in May to introduce a committee system for some of the portfolio areas; this would cover Adult Education, Transport and Housing, these should create some resilience and greater accountability and transparency.</li> <li>•The Chair of each committee would bring decisions to the Board for final approval. The system would allow leaders to be part of the main portfolios.</li> <li>•The Board would appoint to all committees at the annual general meeting.</li> <li>•The LEP Business Board would sit in parallel to these committees. There would not be a replica of existing LEP; the business board would be new.</li> </ul>
5.	<b>Mass Rapid Transport Review – Terms</b>	The Committee received the report which outlined the points needed to consider the terms

Item	Topic	Decision <i>[None of the decisions below are key decisions]</i>
	<b>of Reference</b>	<p>of reference for the Mass Rapid Transport review group.</p> <p>The Chair of the Task and Finish group advised that the group had decided to secure an independent consultant to undertake a number of public evidence sessions and coordinate the evidence.</p> <p>A budget of £15-25k had been granted for the group.</p> <p>The Task and Finish Group would run parallel to the second stage of the Mass Rapid Transport project.</p> <p>The Committee agreed the terms of reference for the Mass Rapid Transport Task and Finish Group.</p>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Combined Authority Forward Plan</b>	The Committee had no comments to make regarding the forward plan of the Combined Authority.
<b>7.</b>	<b>Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme Report</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>The Committee agreed to cancel the April O&amp;S Committee meeting as there was no Board meeting that month.</p> <p>The Committee members agreed that an induction session before the annual general meeting in May would be helpful.</p>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Date of Next Meeting</b>	The next meeting would be held on the 29 <sup>th</sup> May 2018 at 11am at Fenland District Council.