

ITEM TO BE CONSIDERED IF THE CHAIR DECIDES IT IS URGENT

| CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH COMBINED | AGENDA ITEM No: 4.1 (b) |
|--|-------------------------|
| AUTHORITY BOARD | |
| 26 JULY 2017 | PUBLIC REPORT |

REPORT FROM THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE.

1.0 URGENCY

- 1.1 Under chapter 5 paragraph 4.5, the Chair may determine that an item of business that has not been open to prior public inspection should be considered at the meeting as a matter of urgency. Any urgent items shall comply with Transparency Rules, Forward Plan and Key Decisions in chapter 6 of the Constitution.
- 1.2 The reason for urgency is that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee only met two days before the Board meeting and would want to put the revised arrangements in place at their next meeting, which is before the next Board meeting in September.

2.0 PURPOSE

2.1 At the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on the 24th July 2017, the committee resolved that the Chair should attend the Combined Authority Board meeting on the 26th July 2017 to present the following recommendations:

That the Board consider that a standing item is placed on its agenda to allow the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to present recommendations from the Committee to the Board regarding items on its agenda; Voting arrangements Simple majority of the Members, including the LEP

- That should a further Combined Authority Plan be proposed, following the end of the first 100 day plan, that plan is developed in consultation with the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and that all future similar plans brought forward are also developed in consultation with the Overview and scrutiny Committee.
- The Overview and Scrutiny Committee request the Board to note that the Committee has agreed to appoint shadow portfolio holders from within the Overview and Scrutiny Committee membership (Appendix 1);
- 4. The Board note that the Committee has heard from the Mayor and two portfolio holders at their last two meetings. The Committee welcome 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;
 - the Committee will send questions to portfolio holders in advance of the meeting but may ask a number of supplementary questions.

4.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

4.1 There are no constitutional implications as it is not necessary to include working arrangements between the Board and the Committee in the constitution.

5.0 EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Not applicable.

6.0 APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Shadow Portfolio holders

| Source Documents | <u>Location</u> |
|------------------|-----------------|
| n/a | n/a |

Appendix 1

| CABINET | Portfolio Holder | O&S Member Interest |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| Mayor | James Palmer | Cllr Batchelor Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee |
| Deputy Mayor (Statutory) | Cllr Robin Howe | Cllr Hayward Vice-chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee |
| Deputy Mayor (Constitutional) | Cllr John Holdich | Cllr Hudson Cllr Murphy |
| Fiscal | Cllr Steve Count | Cllr Sharp Cllr Cantrill |
| New homes and communities | Cllr Peter Topping | Cllr Mason Cllr Riley |
| Transport and infrastructure | Cllr Charles Roberts | Cllr Baigent Cllr Carter |
| Employment and Skills | Cllr John Clark | Cllr Nethsingha Cllr Over |
| Strategic Planning | Cllr Lewis Herbert | Cllr Bradley Cllr Yeulett |