

## **Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

## Tuesday 9th January 2024

Venue:	Huntingdon Town Hall	
Time:	11:40am	
Present:	Cllr Steve Allen Cllr David Brown Cllr Charlotte Cane Cllr Martin Smart Cllr Martin Hassall Cllr Jon Neish Cllr Peter Fane Cllr Aiden Van de Weyer Cllr Anna Bradnam Cllr Mark Goldsack	Peterborough City Council East Cambs District Council East Cambs District Council Cambridge City Council Huntingdonshire District Council Huntingdonshire District Council South Cambs District Council South Cambs District Council Cambridgeshire County Council Cambridgeshire County Council
Apologies	Cllr Maureen Davis Cllr Anne Hay Cllr Tim Griffin Cllr John Fox Cllr Judith Rippeth	Fenland District Council Fenland District Council Cambridge City Council Peterborough First South Cambs District Council

Minutes:		
1	Apologies for Absence	
1.1	Apologies received from Anne Hay, Cllr Maureen Davis, Cllr Tim Griffin, Cllr John Fox and Cllr Judith Rippeth substituted by Cllr Peter Fane	
2	Declarations of Interest	
2.1	No declarations of interest received.	
3	Corporate Strategy & Medium-Term Financial Plan Consultation	
3.1	The Committee received the report which provided consultation responses to the Combined Authority Board meeting on the 31st January 2024 regarding the draft Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) and the draft Corporate Strategy and requested the committee's feedback.	
3.2	The following points were raised during the discussion:-	
	Officers advised that social media had been the main approach for advertising the consultation with 18 social media posts on a variety of platforms. Paper copies had also been placed at a number of identified locations after consultation with constituent councils.	
	A modest amount of paid campaigns had been utilized and the CA had tried to ensure that the website and technologies were accessible to as many people as possible, for example ensuring that the webpage was usable for those using mobile phones.	
	Officers took on board the point from members that freepost could be considered in future consultations.	

In response to a question about examining the statistical significance officers advised that there were too few responses and that they would use what they received to identify any gaps in the geographical area.

In response to a question on the point in the MTFP about 600 affordable homes and whether the CA still delivered on housing officers advised that these related to the continuation of the final grants that had been paid out.

Officers agreed to check whether all parishes had been directly contacted for the consultation.

In response to a question about how the CA would set a budget next year when the corporate plan was only relevant until 2025, officers advised that the budget next year would be based on the existing MTFP and the Corporate Plan agreed this year but this could be adapted depending on the results of the Mayoral election in 2025.

The Committee were advised that the decision about a Mayoral precept was a Mayor's decision and that it would take 2/3rds of the Board to veto the decision on the precept.

In response to a question on the percentage for staff pay increases officers advised that the 4% increase had been estimated on the figures that had been available in November and that it had been viewed that the rate of inflation would fall but not as rapidly as getting back down to the 2% level. If the fall in interest was less than 4% then the CA may have more money to invest into further areas. It was important to note that the forecasting on pay was done at the national level and was down to the negotiations that would take place next year.

In response to a question on the funding for the provision of electrical charging points members were advised that the data had not been available at the time of publishing but that this would be included in the final figures.

In response to a question on bus franchising and whether this would be value for money officers advised that an audit had been carried out and they would rely on the final audit reports before making a judgement. The Committee requested that they be given an opportunity to scrutinise the plans for bus franchising and enhanced partnerships and were advised a report would be available for the January OSC meeting.

In response to a question about the Mayor's precept the members were advised that the Mayor's budget formed part of the CA order and it was in the Mayor's power to reduce, increase or end a precept.

The current precept was £12 and there are proposals to have a further £24 added this year which would make the precept going forward £36. Further details around the precept would be available once the final budget had been published on the 22<sup>nd</sup> January and the Committee would consider it at their meeting at the end of January.

The Chair made a point about the £1 bus fare cap and that it was disappointing that it was only per bus journey rather than the full journey, meaning a journey needing 2 buses would cost £2. It would be good if this scheme was the first stage towards something more comprehensive and consideration for all modes of transport be given.

The Chair also commented that within the corporate plan the two infrastructure constraints detailed should also include the peat within the fens as a major resource along with water and energy concerns.

## 3.3 The Committee **RESOLVED** to provide the following feedback on the consultation:

- 1) The Committee commented that as there was no detail on the precept currently provided that they would reserve commenting until further information on what the level of precept would be, what it would pay for, the level of social value it provided and requested that a robust and detailed report be provided to the Committee on the Mayor's precept for the January meeting for members to consider.
- 2) The Committee welcomed that the MTFP, Corporate Plan and the Mayoral ambitions were now all linked as it brought all the pieces together, the Committee requested that a good

	narrative that provided the detail that OSC required to scrutinize effectively be included in the final budget.
3.4	ACTION
	The Committee requested that officers look into improving the timetabling for OSC meeting to ensure the timings were more effective for scrutiny to feed into work being done by the CA.
4.	Date of Next Meeting
4.1	Public Meeting – 29 <sup>th</sup> January at Huntingdonshire District Council

Meeting Closed:

Chair