



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE  
& PETERBOROUGH**  
COMBINED AUTHORITY

## **CAMBRIDGESHIRE & PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY – OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

### **DRAFT MINUTES**

**Date:** 24<sup>th</sup> July 2017

**Time:** 2pm

**Present:**

Cllr Robin Carter	Huntingdon District Council
Cllr Terry Hayward	Huntingdon District Council
Cllr Alan Sharp	East Cambs District Council
Cllr Alex Riley	South Cambs District Council
Cllr Philippa Hart	South Cambs District Council
Cllr Fred Yeulett	Fenland District Council
Cllr David Mason	Fenland District Council
Cllr Dave Baigent	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Rod Cantrill	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Jan French	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Lucy Nethsingha	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr David Over	Peterborough City Council
Cllr Ed Murphy	Peterborough City Council

<b>Officers present –</b> Kim Sawyer	Monitoring Officer
Martin Whiteley	Chief Executive Officer
Debbie Forde	Governance Advisor
Anne Gardiner	Scrutiny Officer

#### **1. Apologies**

- 1.1 Apologies received from Cllr Batchelor, substituted by Cllr Hart and apologies received from Cllr Bradley.

## **2. Declaration of Interests**

2.1 There were no declarations of interest.

## **3. Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 26<sup>th</sup> June 2017.**

3.1 Committee members requested that 'Matters Arising' be added to the minute item on the agenda.

3.2 Committee members requested that in reference to the issue of public questions that was discussed at the last meeting, that a report be brought to the September committee meeting for the members to discuss.

3.3 The Committee agreed the minutes from the June meeting.

## **4. Interview – Portfolio Holder for Transport and Infrastructure**

4.1 The Councillor Charles Roberts, Portfolio Holder for Transport and Infrastructure, introduced the work related to his portfolio area, and responded to questions from Members of the Committee.

The following points were made:-

- The interim transport plan was a combination of the Peterborough City Plan and the Cambridgeshire County Plan; there were limitations to this as both plans were put together in isolation. They were also unable to anticipate the scale of investment that would come through the Combined Authority nor able to fully anticipate the scale of the ambition for housing development and job creation. Therefore, those plans by their nature were limited but necessary following the establishment of the Combined Authority.
- The Combined Authority was an opportunity to influence many things that have previously frustrated constituent councils. There was more learning to be done and considerable opportunities to be had. The Mayor's 100 day plan was very much about commissioning studies to understand those opportunities and the needs across the entire area. It was about setting the scene, setting the context and tempo for the Combined Authority going forward.
- A new integrated Transport Plan had been commissions to complement the other feasibility studies and to encompass the wider combined authority area. The new plan would help to maximize the wider ambitions for the whole of the combined authority area and the extra funding that would be.
- The work of the Independent Economic Commission and the non statutory Spatial Plan would inform the work of the new Transport Plan to understand the current situation and to maximize future economic opportunities, social movement and changes to work patterns and variations across the county, both in the its cities, market towns and

rural villages; it needed to understand its future economy and population.

- Relationships with neighboring counties had to be considered as people travel within and through the county on key trunk roads. It was important to understand how a major project such as the expansion of the M11 corridor might impact the rest of the counties roads before going forward with the other projects - smaller, short term improvements planned would still continue. The A1 will be included as it was a key route.
- Talks were already ongoing with Suffolk regarding the six junctions and jointly funded study had been agreed; the results of which could have a major impact on the south of the county.
- Wisbech Town was an exciting opportunity but it must be connected to the rest of the country, not just to Cambridge, by both road links and rail links. The existing industries could be very attractive especially after Brexit and having heavy rail infrastructure in place would be key to bringing economic prosperity to the area.
- The Combined Authority was aware of issues surrounding the use of cars by most of the population in rural areas and the isolation of communities but building bigger roads was not necessarily the solution. Understanding the movement of people would be key when considering the franchising of the bus services together with other different mechanisms.
- In response to a question regarding whether a 'Transport for Cambridge and Peterborough' similar to the models of London and Manchester authorities had been considered, this was one of the options being considered but London and Manchester were metropolitan cities and therefore very different to the area of the Combined Authority. The Cornwall/Devon modal would be more likely to be considered.
- The Combined Authority understood the frustrations over the long lead in times for larger projects but engagement with the rail operators and use of the information that would be gathered by the Combined Authority could be used to influence and speed up the process and deliver some quick, simple fixes. East Coast rail and the development of Alconbury were under consideration by officers.
- In response to a question about the Mayor's ability to use his influence in regards to the rail providers the Committee were told that the Mayor would use his power to ensure the rail operators would get on board.
- Wisbech Rail development was key to spreading the economic prosperity across the county. Network Rail have selected the consultants for the next stage and these would be formally appointed in August and would start work in September.
- Smaller transport infrastructure projects would still be done and it would be up to the representatives from the constituent authorities to bring

forward any urgent plans that needed to be looked at and how the Combined Authority could take these forward. It was important for the flow of information between the Board and Committee and the constituent councils on any items that were of importance to local people. Local MP's were on board with the Mayor's plans.

4.2 The Chair thanked the Portfolio Holder for attending to highlight the work of his portfolio area and to answer the committee's questions.

## **5. Interview – Portfolio Holder for Strategic Planning**

5.1 Councillor Lewis Herbert, the Portfolio Holder for Strategic Planning introduced the work related to his portfolio area, and responded to questions from Members of the Committee.

The following points were made:-

- 5.2
- This portfolio lead on the non-spatial plan; some authorities had a statutory plan, the Combined Authority did not, The Combined Authority Order ensured the Local Plans were sovereign.
  - The Combined Authority's non-statutory spatial plan would be in addition to the existing local plans that go through major community engagement. The non statutory spatial plan could add value to the local plans as it combined the ability of the Combined Authority to invest its own money and generate other investment in infrastructure and work with other organisations such as Network Rail or Highways England to develop opportunities. It would include work from the Independent Economic Commission and the LEP .
  - The output would be a focused spatial plan in terms of it policies but stage two would discuss specific sites.
  - Several of the Local Plans had been unable to deliver on their local plans, for example with stalled sites. The non-statutory special plan would be looking at areas of the county that had challenges, stalled sites or threshold sites and would help bring forward the next generation of local plans. A land commission would be established building on the work of 'Making Assets Count' to maximize the use of public land holdings.
  - The Combined Authority should focus on areas of disadvantage by focusing on inclusive growth and geographically recognising the urban/rural divisions.
  - It would hinge on choices of the scale of site and nature of the existing communities, primarily it would start by looking at housing. There was an obstacle with housing and ensuring people's ability to commute to work, there would need to be good public transport links.
  - In terms of deprivation the Combined Authority cannot be overly ambitious. It was in the interest of the county that growth was distributed across the county and the extent to which the Combined Authority's interventions could assist with this. The Combined Authority would

need to take ownership of some of the challenging sites in partnership with the districts and making sure that any obstacles were unblocked.

- The Combined Authority did not have Compulsory Purchase Order powers; the Portfolio Holders advice would be to over allocate on the sites to tackle this but the decision would be down to individual authorities.
- The non-statutory and the Transport Plans must work as a partnership; transport infrastructure investments must enable growth occurs on a wider geography and if housing was going to be added then there must be improvements in transport to enable this.
- The Mayor does not have the power to put a cap on land prices; there would need to be a change in local legislation to allow that to happen and would probably be in regards to transport planning.
- The influence that the Combined Authority could exert over employment and businesses was different to the influence it could exert on housing and transport. The work of the Independent Economic Commission would be key to understanding the economy and come up with scenarios on how many jobs could be created. We can get jobs to move away from Cambridge but it would not be the high-tech jobs but rather other smaller firms.
- In regards to creating jobs more affordable housing needed to be created, which would enable people to live closer to where they worked. However there was a real challenge in the north of the county because viability is much harder the further you move away from Cambridge.
- Cleaner energy and growth was a priority; engaging with the utilities companies would be key as they were the main obstacles. There was a commitment for more sustainable and renewable energies but a discussion was needed with the utility companies.
- The LEP had good relationships with other organisations and it would be good to see better integration of the Combined Authority and the LEP to utilise those relationships.
- In response to a question regarding potential conflicts between current plans of the City Deal and the Mayor's plans. the Portfolio Holder advised that he would be discuss this with the Mayor. There would be a lot of analysis and evidence based decisions.
- The Portfolio Holder agreed to provide a note for committee members examples of this modal of a non-spatial planning was used anywhere else in the country.

5.3 The Chair thanked the Portfolio Holder for attending to highlight the work of his portfolio area and to answer the committee's questions.

## 6. **Shadow Portfolio Holders**

6.1 The Committee received the report which outlined the role of the proposed shadow portfolio holders and asked members to decide if they would like to allocate members to undertake these roles.

6.2 The members resolved to allocate members of the committee to the roles of shadow portfolio holders. See Appendix A.

## **7. Combined Authority Agenda**

7.1 The Committee considered the agenda that had been published for the upcoming Combined Authority Board meeting on 26 July and were asked to comment on any issues they felt should be raised by the Committee.

7.2 The Committee agreed that now we have appointed shadow portfolio holders they would be able to look at the relevant reports on future agendas.

7.3 The Committee noted the agenda of the Combined Authority Board meeting on 26<sup>th</sup> July.

## **8. Combined Authority Forward Plan**

8.1 The Committee had no comments to make at this time regarding the forward plan of the Combined Authority.

## **9. Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme**

9.1 The Committee received the work programme and were asked to comment or make any amendments.

9.2 The Committee discussed how they would like to structure their meeting going forward with various suggestions being put forward in regards to what type of scrutiny the committee should undertake and the timing of the meetings in regards to the Board meetings.

The Committee discussed the roll of call in and the need to have the meeting after the Board meeting rather than before – the Monitoring Officer advised that if the Committee continued to meet before the Board meeting that members could prepare a draft call in report outlining the committees concerns and any recommendations. The Chair would then attend the Board meeting to put forward the committee's recommendations. If the Board chose to ignore these then the committee members would contact the Monitoring Officer to ask for the call in report to be activated and start the call in process.

It was resolved that the Committee would continue to hold their meetings before the Board meeting and would review the structure after the November meeting and after training with the Centre for Public Scrutiny.

9.3 The Committee agreed that an action sheet be produced after each meeting to show what actions had been agreed either by the committee or the board members and officers invited to attend.

9.4 The Committee resolved that they would like to invite the Chief Executive for the Combined Authority be invited to attend the September meeting.

9.5 The Committee resolved that they would like there to be an item on the Board agenda to enable the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to provide feedback on items that had been discussed at their meeting held beforehand and that the Chair would attend the Board meeting on Wednesday 26<sup>th</sup> July to present the Committee's proposal and other issues that had been raised at this meeting.

9.6 The Committee resolved to put forward the below recommendation to the Board:

'The Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommends to the Board of the Combined Authority that at the end of the Mayor's 100 Day Plan (August 16<sup>th</sup> 2017) that should a further Combined Authority Plan be proposed, that plan is developed with involvement from the Overview and Scrutiny committee and that all future similar plans brought forward are developed in Consultation with the Overview and scrutiny Committee.'

9.7 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee resolved to ask the Board to note that the Committee has agreed to appoint shadow portfolio holders from within the Overview and Scrutiny Committee membership.

9.8 The Committee resolved to highlight to the Board that the committee has heard from the Mayor and two portfolio holders at their last two meetings and welcomes discussions with the portfolio holders and would propose that for future meetings:

a) the Portfolio Holders should prepare a 10 minute presentation for the Committee;

b) the Committee will send questions to portfolio holders in advance of the meeting but may ask a number of supplementary questions.

## **10. Date and Location of Next Meeting**

10.1 The Committee asked for officers to look into moving meetings to a 10am start.

10.2 The Committee agreed that the next meeting would be held at Cambridge City Council on the 21<sup>st</sup> September 2017.

## **Appendix 1**

<b>CABINET</b>	<b>Key Areas of Responsibility</b>	<b>Portfolio Holder</b>	<b>O&amp;S Shadow Member</b>
Mayor	Chair of Combined Authority Securing more power & investment into Cambridgeshire & Peterborough – including future devolution deals Public service reform	James Palmer	Cllr Batchelor
Deputy Mayor (Statutory)	Chair of Investment Group Economic & Productivity Strategy International trade, inward investment and business development	Cllr Robin Howe	Cllr Hayward
Deputy Mayor (Constitutional)	Working with the LEP to develop the future industrial sectors of Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Tourism	Cllr John Holdich	Cllr Hudson Cllr Murphy
Fiscal	Strategic fiscal planning Investment strategy Budget setting and monitoring Vice Chair of Investment Group	Cllr Steve Count	Cllr Sharp Cllr Cantrill
New homes and communities	Housing Strategy Housing Programmes to drive up housing supply Strategic relationship with housing providers, developers and builders Sustainable communities and community infrastructure Vice Chair of Delivery Group	Cllr Peter Topping	Cllr Mason Cllr Riley
Transport and infrastructure	Delivery of growth Infrastructure including the key route network Key Transport Partnerships including Network Rail & the private sector Safe, secure and sustainable transport including buses Member of Delivery Group	Cllr Charles Roberts	Cllr Baigent Cllr Carter
Employment and Skills	Skills Strategy - matching skills to high quality jobs Promoting skills and apprenticeship excellence Key Partnerships with Universities & Higher Education Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Apprenticeships Member of Delivery Group	Cllr John Clark	Cllr Nethsingha Cllr Over
Strategic Planning	Non-statutory spatial plan Chair of Land Commission - supply of public sector land	Cllr Lewis Herbert	Cllr Bradley Cllr Yeulett



	Supporting disadvantaged communities and individuals to benefit from growth and prosperity Energy and Clean Growth Member of Investment Group		
--	---	--	--