

**MINUTES OF THE JOINT SCRUTINY COMMITTEES MEETING
HELD AT 6.00PM ON
12 FEBRUARY 2019
IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL PETERBOROUGH**

- Committee Members Present:** Councillors J Stokes (Chairman), A Ali, S Bashir, R Brown, G Casey, A Ellis, M Farooq, J A Fox, J R Fox, C Harper, S Hemraj, M Jamil, D Jones, S Martin, G Nawaz, R Bisby, E Murphy, D Over, B Rush, B Saltmarsh, N Sandford, N Simons,
Co-opted Members: Parish Councillors Henry Clark, Neil Boyce, Junaid Bhatti, James Hayes,
Independent Co-opted Members Dr Watson, Alastair Kingsley, Peter Cantley
- Also Present:** Councillor Holdich, Leader of the Council and Member of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority
Councillor Fitzgerald, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Integrated Adult Social Care and Health
Councillor Ayres, Cabinet Member for Education Skills and University
Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development
Councillor Lamb, Cabinet Member for Public Health
Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources
Councillor Smith, Cabinet Member for Children's Services
Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities
Councillor Allen, Cabinet Advisor to the Leader
- Officers Present:** Gillian Beasley, Chief Executive
Peter Carpenter, Acting Corporate Director, Resources
Adrian Chapman, Service Director, Communities and Safety
Amy Brown, Senior Lawyer Litigation and Deputy Monitoring Officer
Annette Joyce, Interim Corporate Director, Growth and Regeneration
Wendi Ogle-Welbourn, Executive Director, People and Communities, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Councils
Amanda Askham, Director of Business Improvement and Development
Sue Grace, Director of Customer and Digital Services
Will Patten, Service Director Commissioning
Dr Liz Robin, Director of Public Health
Lou Williams, Service Director, Children & Safeguarding
Jonathan Lewis, Service Director, Education
Dan Kalley, Senior Democratic Services Officer
Pippa Turvey, Democratic and Constitutional Services Manager
Rachel Edwards, Head of Constitutional Services
- Others Present:** Councillor Shaz Nawaz, Labour Group Leader

9. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN

The Democratic and Constitutional Services Manager opened the meeting and advised the Committee that in accordance with *Part 4, Section 8 – Scrutiny Committee Procedure Rules, section 13, Joint Meetings of Scrutiny Committees* a Chairman would be required to be appointed from among the Chairmen of the Committees who were holding the meeting. Nominations were sought from those Chairmen present at the meeting which were Councillor Simons, Chairman of Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Stokes, Chairman of the Health Scrutiny Committee and Councillor Harper, Chairman of the Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee. Councillor Stokes was nominated by Councillor Simons and seconded by Councillor Harper. There being no further nominations Councillor Stokes was therefore appointed Chairman.

The Chairman welcomed everyone present and explained that the purpose of the meeting was to provide an opportunity for all members of each Scrutiny Committee to scrutinise the Medium Term Financial Strategy, Budget 2019/20 to 2021/22 Tranche Three proposals document as part of the formal consultation process before being presented to Cabinet on 25 February 2019 for approval and recommendation to Full Council on 6 March 2019.

10. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Lane, Councillor Aitken, Councillor Serluca, Councillor Warren, Councillor Goodwin, Councillor Barkham, Councillor Shaheed, Councillor Dowson and Councillor Fower. Councillor Gul Nawaz substituted for Councillor Goodwin. Councillor Murphy substituted for Councillor Fower.

Apologies were received from Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Waste and Street Scene and Councillor Fuller, Cabinet Advisor for Commercial Strategy and Investments

The following co-opted members also sent apologies: Education Co-opted members Flavio Vettese. Parish Councillor Co-opted Member Susie Lucas and Keith Lievesley, Richard Clarke.

11. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND WHIPPING DECLARATIONS

There were no declarations of interest or whipping declarations.

12. MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY (MTFS) 2019/20 - 2021/22 – TRANCHE THREE PROPOSALS

The Cabinet Member for Resources gave a short introduction to the Budget 2019/20 – 2021/22 Tranche Three proposals document accompanied by the Acting Corporate Director of Resources and went through a short PowerPoint presentation a copy of which can be found attached at Appendix 1 of the minutes.

Each section of the budget proposals document was then taken in order according to how it was presented in the Budget Book. The relevant Cabinet Member or Corporate Director were given the opportunity to introduce their section of the budget before taking questions from the Committee.

Questions and observations were made around the following areas:

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
<p>1. Presentation and Introduction of the Medium Term Financial Strategy Tranche Three Proposals Document</p> <p>Cabinet report dated 4 February 2019 (pages 1 to 40) of the MTFS 2019/20 to 2021/22 Tranche Three Proposals Document</p>	<p>Members sought clarification over the use of reserves. £3 million had been used from reserves, however it seemed as if this had not come from the general fund.</p> <p>In addition Members asked what the overall total of reserves the Council had was.</p> <p>It was important that the Council looked at all possible ways of balancing the budget outside of using the Councils reserves.</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member for Resources confirmed that the Councils General Fund reserve balance was £6 million. Overall Peterborough had the 11th lowest reserve fund out of all Unitary Authorities.</p> <p>It was important that the Council did not carry on using the reserves going forward and investigated alternative methods of balancing the budget.</p>
	<p>A query was raised as to how much progress had been made under the Standing up for Peterborough campaign. Members asked what the current situation was in relation to the campaign and progress that had been made.</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member for Resources confirmed that the campaign was still vital. Through the campaign and wider campaigns from bodies like the LGA the Council had received an extra £2.15 million from the Government towards social care. In addition a further £1.6 million had been received to help local communities.</p> <p>Members were informed that the debate had moved on since the campaign started. There was more emphasis on lobbying from Directors of Adult and Social Care and Chief Executives across the Country asking for more funding for local authorities.</p> <p>The Acting Corporate Director Resources stated that over the past year the best way to lobby Government was through the LGA,</p>

		<p>as Councils across the Country had varying demands placed on their services.</p>
	<p>Members had concerns over the use of Council reserves to balance the budget. Had the Council considered other options before using these reserves?</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member for Resources stated that using reserves was not an easy decision. However the Council was facing a number of challenges in balancing its budget. Going forward the Council would look at ways of delivering services differently, potentially using outside and voluntary sector organisations to assist. It was important that the Council continued to use external organisations to challenge the way the budget was being used. The LGA had also made suggestions to the way the Council used its budget.</p> <p>The Acting Corporate Director added that in order to evaluate all options properly the Council needed sufficient time to do this, in addition any options suggested needed to be deliverable.</p>
	<p>Members sought clarification over the sale of assets in terms of what was sold and what was to be sold going forward. Assurances were sought that the £9 million for the proposed University in Peterborough had been secured as there was conflicting information and it was not identifiable in the budget.</p>	<p>The Leader of the Council confirmed that the money had been secured. The University had not received the money yet, they had to draw down on this as and when it was required. So far £750k had been drawn down by the LEP, £3.8 million had been allocated to the University of which they had spent around £1 million. Furthermore £9.7 million was available to drawdown on once the building works had commenced.</p>

	<p>Councillor Murphy asked for clarification over the cost of repairing Rhubarb Bridge.</p> <p>Councillor Murphy seconded by Councillor Jamil recommended that Cabinet review the level of reserves with a view to placing £1 million back into reserves in case of any financial difficulties over the next year and further review the policy on the use of Council assets.</p> <p>The recommendation was put to the vote (5 in favour, 14 against, 0 abstentions) The recommendation was therefore not carried.</p>	<p>The Leader of the Council confirmed that the money that had been earmarked to knock the bridge down was now going to be used to repair the bridge, which was what the residents of Peterborough had asked for.</p> <p>In terms of the at grade crossings this was an essential part of the upgrade works. Without these it would be impossible for residents, particularly those who were disabled to cross safely.</p>
<p>The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget.</p>		

<p>2. Appendix A Page 41 to 50 2019/2020 – 2021/22 MTFS Detailed Budget Position and Appendix B Page 51 to 53 Budget Proposals – Tranche One, Two and Three</p>	<p>Members sought clarification over income generated through business rates, particularly around the Fletton Quays development.</p>	<p>The Acting Corporate Director Resources stated that in terms of business rates, these were to be re-based. There were likely to be reflected in future budgets once the valuation office had completed their work.</p> <p>The Acting Corporate Director confirmed that potentially the business rates received from Fletton Quays and other Developments across Peterborough could be a six figure sum, however this depended on what comes out of the fairer funding review and business rates rebaselining.</p>
<p>The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget.</p>		
<p>3. Appendix C Page 55 Council Tax Information</p>	<p>There were no questions or comments for this section of the budget.</p>	
<p>The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget.</p>		
<p>4. Appendix – D Page 57 to 60 Grant Register And Appendix E Pages 61 Fees and Charges</p>	<p>There were no questions or comments for this section of the budget.</p>	
<p>The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget.</p>		
<p>5. Appendix – F Page 63 to 66 Performance Data</p>	<p>There were no questions or comments for this section of the budget.</p>	
<p>The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget.</p>		

<p>6. Appendix – G Page 67 to 69 Capital Programme Scheme 2019/20=2023/24</p>	<p>There were no questions or comments for this section of the budget.</p>	
<p>The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget.</p>		
<p>7. Appendix H Budget Consultation Document including Medium Term Financial Strategy 2019/20 Tranche Three Budget Proposals starting on page 71</p> <p>Introduction, The Budget Process, Priorities, Council Tax, Funding and Council Service Expenditure, Capital Expenditure Budget, Overall Budget Position, and Budget Consultation Pages 71 to 83</p>	<p>Members raised concerns over the number of meetings of the cross party working group for with regards to Tranche Two and Three of the budget. In addition these meetings had only taken place around three days before the proposals were published. It was important that the cross party working group be given more time to influence proposals in the future.</p> <p>The Joint Scrutiny Committee agreed (Unanimous) to recommend that more time be given to the Cross Party Working Group to be able to influence budget proposals.</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member for Resources acknowledged that there had not been as many meetings as in the past. However assurances were given that more time would be allowed in future for the cross party group to make suggestions to budget proposals.</p>
<p>The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget.</p>		
<p>AGREED ACTIONS</p> <p>The Joint Scrutiny Committee requested that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Cross Party Working Group for the budget be allowed more time do make suggestions and proposals to future budget tranches. 		
<p>8. Governance Budget Proposals Page 84</p>	<p>There were no questions or comments for this section of the budget.</p>	
<p>The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget.</p>		

<p>9. Growth and Regeneration Budget Proposals Pages 85 to 87</p>	<p>Members sought clarification that following the sale of Peterborough United Football Club, that if a new stadium was to be build a covenant be placed in the sale to confirm that the existing facilities be retained for the benefit of local residents.</p>	<p>The Leader of the Council confirmed that the existing facilities would remain for the use of local residents.</p>
<p>The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget.</p>		
<p>10. People and Communities Budget Proposals Pages 88 to 89</p>	<p>Members raised concerns over the funding for social care from central government. In addition did the Council have a plan B if a reduction in funding was realised?</p>	<p>The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Integrated Adult Social Care and Health confirmed that there was a White Paper going through Parliament which would set out future funding of social care. There had been some money coming in from the Better Care Fund and the CCG. However it was important to remember that there was a rising demand for adult social care and day care opportunities.</p> <p>There was further work being carried out with colleagues from Cambridgeshire recognising that there was a need to fund these areas in a different way and it was hoped the government would discuss these matters.</p>
	<p>There was concern that educational support for early years was decreasing and that this would affect nearly all schools in Peterborough. What was the Council doing to assist those schools who faced funding cuts?</p>	<p>The Service Director Education confirmed that austerity measures were hitting schools. Overall the money being put into schools was increasing, however the number of pupils going into school was increasing at a faster rate. The funding formula used varied from year to year and that funding gap could be measured in pence or tens of pounds. Some large schools could be affected, however members were re-assured that there were no planned redundancies of teachers going forward.</p>

	The Joint Scrutiny Committee agreed (Unanimous) that the Council lobby government for fairer funding for schools.	
<p>The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget.</p> <p>AGREED ACTIONS</p> <p>The Joint Scrutiny Committee requested:</p> <p>1. That the Council lobby central government for fairer funding for schools.</p>		
<p>11. Public Health Budget Proposals Page 90</p>	<p>Members sought clarification over how public health was being affected by the move away from central government, and how were staff in this area being supported.</p>	<p>The Director of Public Health confirmed that the Council had received a reduced grant from central government which had been challenging. However, key services had been maintained by working closely with colleagues from Cambridgeshire.</p>
<p>The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget</p>		
<p>12. Resources Budget Proposals Pages 91 to 93</p>	<p>Members queried when the switch to Microsoft was due to take place.</p> <p>Questions were asked as to how much expenditure the Council had undertaken to sort these issues and what were the projected savings of joining up with Cambridgeshire County Council.</p> <p>In addition Members asked for reassurances that these issues would not happen in the future and asked why the Council had gone down the route of using google in the first instance.</p>	<p>The Acting Corporate Director stated that a project plan was now in place for the merging of IT systems with Cambridgeshire in terms of using Microsoft 365. It was anticipated that this would be finalised in the coming months.</p> <p>In terms of the Serco contract, that had a further 18 months to run. A number of options were being looked at, especially in light of joining up with Cambridgeshire. ICT projects were part of the Councils Capital funding going forward.</p> <p>The Council decided to switch to google in 2014, along with a number of other local authorities. However, it had become evident that not enough critical mass in terms of public service organisations had followed this route. It was therefore essential to re-evaluate how the Council operated it systems in order to make</p>

		<p>transacting with other public service organisations easier.</p> <p>Microsoft 365 had been brought to counteract the threat from google. Many users of Microsoft 365 had commented that it was comparable to the current google setup.</p> <p>The cost associated with setting up the new system included costs from start to finish for the whole project. Although there was initial spent a number of savings would be realised going forward.</p>
	<p>Members questioned the Capital Programme financing. The programme of asset disposal had seemed to be ambitious, and therefore a budget saving had to be included to compensate for this. Was there an issue with the way the assets were being disposed of?</p>	<p>The Acting Corporate Director confirmed that over the past two years the Council had got to and hit the targets required for the asset disposal. These subsidised the revenue costs of the capital programme through offsetting the Minimum Revenue Provision. However, this use of capital receipts has meant that the Council has forgone the application of £30 million of funding directly to capital schemes which has then required debt financing. This was generally through the use of long term debt at around 30-40 years.</p> <p>In net terms capital programme assumptions had come down from £135 million to £114 million. The Council needed to look at terms of debt for what it needed to fund, along with taking into account other people's money.</p>
<p>The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget</p>		
<p>13. Staffing Implications Page 94</p>	<p>There were no questions or comments for this section of the budget.</p>	
<p>The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget</p>		

<p>14. Appendix I Pages 95 - 102</p> <p>Savings RAG Rating</p>	<p>Members questioned whether new system were to be in place to issue permits for the new Waste Recycling Centre. The current system of posting permits was cumbersome.</p> <p>The Joint Scrutiny Committee agreed (Unanimous) that flexibility in the budget be made to implement new ways of issuing permits for the new Waste Recycling Centre and that this be referred to the Fly-Tipping Task and Finish Group</p>	<p>The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Integrated Adult Social Care and Health commented that there were issues around the Councils waste policy. It was hoped the policy around issuing permits would be streamlined and made easier for residents to obtain.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Resources confirmed that the Council were to move to electronic permits, which would be valid for 12 months. The new Waste Recycling Centre would also be more flexible in allowing small business waste to be disposed of at a small cost to the business.</p>
<p>The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget.</p> <p>AGREED ACTIONS:</p> <p>The Joint Scrutiny Committee requested that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Fly-Tipping Task and Finish Group review the proposals in issuing permits for the new Waste Recycling Centre and report any recommendations to Cabinet. 		
<p>15. Appendix J Pages 103 to 109</p> <p>Equality Impact Assessments</p>	<p>There were no questions or comments for this section of the budget.</p>	
<p>The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget</p>		
<p>16. Appendix K Pages 111 to 137</p> <p>Treasury Management Strategy 2019/20 to 2023/24</p>	<p>There were no questions or comments for this section of the budget.</p>	
<p>The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget</p>		

<p>17. Appendix L Pages 139 – 165</p> <p>Capital Strategy 2019 – 2014</p>	<p>There were no questions or comments for this section of the budget.</p>	
<p>The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget</p>		
<p>18. Appendix M Pages 167 – 187</p> <p>Asset Management Plan</p>	<p>There were no questions or comments for this section of the budget.</p>	
<p>The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget</p>		
<p>19. Appendix N Pages 189 to 212</p> <p>Investment Acquisition Strategy</p>	<p>There were no questions or comments for this section of the budget.</p>	
<p>The Committee RESOLVED to note this section of the budget</p>		
<p>20. General Comments, any overall recommendations and Conclusion:</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Resources confirmed that the term MRP stood for Minimum Revenue Provision and was the amount each year that the Council must fund from revenue for debt repayment.</p> <p>The Acting Corporate Director Resources confirmed that the tranche three proposals made provision for an extra £1 million for the Local Authority Trading Company (Latco), some of this was additional transition costs with the remainder additional revenue costs to run the service. For the years 2020/21 an additional £880k was to be provided to run the service and an additional £900k in 2021/22. If the Council had continued with Amey and additional £2.2 million would need to be added to the budget based on costs in the present extension.</p> <p>Members were informed that Amey were not willing to renegotiate the contract on the current terms as it was not economically viable for them. It was confirmed that the contract with Amey had a break clause allowing the Council to come out of the contract.</p> <p>The Leader of the Council stated that by setting up the Latco the Council was in effect saving £1 million pound instead of carrying on using the Amey contract on its present terms.</p> <p>The Acting Corporate Director confirmed that the costs of retendering had been used to go through the process of setting up the Latco.</p>		

The Council would need to evaluate how it was to purchase new vehicles once the current fleet had past their time. It was confirmed that the Council had purchased the current fleet of vehicles from Amey.

13. COMMERCIAL STRATEGY 2018-2021

The Director of Business Improvement and Development introduced the report and commented that the strategy built on a number of existing strategies. It was essential that the new strategy strengthened scrutiny and governance arrangements. The strategy focused on the use of all assets and skills at the Councils disposal in order to generate income and support front line services.

The Joint Scrutiny Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Members raised concerns over the selling of physical buildings, there were questions as to what buildings were being sold or planned to be sold and was this an attempt to plug financial gaps.
- It was important that the Council maximised its assets whether this was selling physical buildings or selling services to other local authorities.
- In relation to assets there were a number of assets that were classed as intellectual property and capacity. It was important to maximise this as much as physical buildings the Council owned.
- The list of properties outlined in the budget were indicative only. The budget did not include anything that the Council was unsure about or had not investigated thoroughly.
- In terms of new revenue being generated the figure of £5 million pound was the net revenue being predicted. With regards to gross revenue this would depend on the schemes being proposed, the timescales to deliver this and how the schemes are rolled out. It was therefore hard to give any accurate figure on gross revenue.
- There were concerns that some of the proposed assets listed would have a negative impact on the local communities. It was asked what criteria was being looked at when determining whether to sell one of those assets. The Acting Corporate Director confirmed that there was a process followed when deciding what was the best use of one of those assets, there might be some buildings that are leased or that the Council would want to keep and regenerate.
- It was important that every proposal goes through the same procedure and it needed to be robustly evaluated. The commercial governance board, which was officer led would have oversight on all proposals, ensuring that nothing was missed or came up without going through the correct processes.
- The Council needed to come up with a strategy for the town centre and how it could make it more attractive for stakeholders.
- The Cabinet needed to look at all properties listed within the budget and provide a justification for them appearing on the list. Members were informed that the justification was a professional opinion of Norfolk Property Services, who had the expertise at looking at the Council's buildings and providing justifications for the Council to analysis.
- It was commented by Members that selling assets did not always work out and it was therefore important that a strong justification for selling a property was put

forward. It was essential to look at the impact of selling a building on a community rather than always thinking of the financial gain.

- The Council was managing to balance its budget despite having a large portion of grants from central government cut.

Councillor Murphy seconded by Councillor Ellis Recommend that further information and dialogue is provided to the whole Council on the assets the Cabinet wish to sell and confirm the list is not everything that it intends to sell. The recommendation was put to the vote (9 in favour, 11 against). The recommendation was therefore defeated.

The Joint Scrutiny Committee **RESOLVED** to:

1. Review and comment on the draft Commercial Strategy 2018-21 attached at Appendix 1, and
2. Endorse the Commercial Strategy 2018-21 for approval by Cabinet on 25 February 2019.

14. LOCAL GOVERNMENT REVIEW OF THE BUDGET - TRANCHE 3

The Acting Corporate Director updated the Committee further commenting that two representatives from the LGA looked in detail at the Councils savings proposals. The LGA commented that Peterborough City Council were headed in the right direction, however needed to work at a faster rate to achieve its financial objectives. The Council was now looking at other options in moving the budget forward.

The Joint Scrutiny Committee **RESOLVED** to:

1. Note the work undertaken by Officers with the Local Government Association (LGA) to scrutinise Tranche 3 of the budget
2. Note the recommendations from the LGA review, which is included in summary format within the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Tranche 3 Document submitted to Cabinet on the 4th February 2019.

15. REVIEW OF SUBSIDISED BUS SERVICES

The Interim Corporate Director, Growth and Regeneration introduced the report and commented that the revised bus subsidies had been looked at by the cross party working group. It was confirmed that there had been no timetable change to routes 60 and 63. In terms of route 61 the 0534 service was to be removed and all services after 1839. With regards to route 62 the following were to be removed 0509, 1955 and 2315. These measures along with budget efficiencies realised a saving of £150k.

The Joint Scrutiny Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Members welcomed the review and commented that it would be beneficial for the savings to be put back into public transport.
- The cross party working group acknowledged that these services, which were put on in 2017 were not beneficial.
- It was argued that these services should have been looked at prior to them being cut without consultation or looking at them in more detail.

- The Cabinet Member for for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development stated that in the previous tranche these were indicative cuts and that more research was going to take place. In addition Stagecoach was in full support with the proposed revisions.
- It was acknowledged that the £150k saving was for Peterborough and had nothing to do with the Combined Authority
- Members queried the transport levy of £3.5 million that was to be paid to to the Combined Authority from 1 April 2019. There was concern over how the money was to be spent.
- The Leader confirmed that the levy took into account concessionary fares and subsidies for the buses.

Councillor Murphy seconded by Councillor Sandford recommended that the Council find out from the Combined Authority what the £3.5 million subsidy Peterborough City Council was paying was to be used for and for the response to be circulated. The recommendation was put to the vote (10 in favour, 9 against). The recommendation was therefore agreed.

AGREED ACTIONS

The Joint Scrutiny Committee **RESOLVED** to endorse:

1. Changes in timetables to the 60s services, which along with budget efficiency measures and negotiated cost reductions will present the Council an annual saving of £150,000.
2. That Officers will develop a publicity campaign with local bus operators to run during 2019/20 to encourage the public to use local bus services.
3. That the work of the Cross Party Bus Consultation Group will continue in order to review the remaining services supported by the Council to ensure best value is obtained for both the Council and the travelling public.

RECOMMENDATION

The Joint Scrutiny Committee **RESOLVED** to recommend that officers ascertain from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority what the £3.5 million transport levy to be paid by Peterborough City Council was to be spend on from 1 April 2019.

CHAIRMAN

The meeting began at 6.00pm and ended at 8.35pm

This page is intentionally left blank