



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE
& PETERBOROUGH**
COMBINED AUTHORITY

CAMBRIDGESHIRE & PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY – OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

DRAFT MINUTES

Date: Monday, 23 January 2023

Time: 11.00

Location: Civic Suite, Pathfinder House, Huntingdon District Council

Members Present:

Cllr L Dupre (Chair)	East Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr A Sharp (Vice-Chair)	East Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr M Hassall	Huntingdonshire District Council
Cllr M Atkins	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr M Goldsack	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr R Robertson	Cambridge City Council
Cllr P Fane	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr A Iqbal	Peterborough City Council
Cllr A Coles	Peterborough City Council
Cllr A Hay	Fenland District Council

Officers:

Gordon Mitchell*	Interim Chief Executive
Edwina Adefehinti*	Chief Officer – Legal & Governance, and Monitoring Officer
Jon Alsop	Chief Finance Officer
Rob Emery	Business Board S151 & Dept.S73 Combined Authority
Tim Bellamy	Interim Head of Transport
Paul Staines*	Improvement Plan Programme Manager
Jodie Townsend*	Governance Improvement Lead
Reena Roojam	Head of Legal and Deputy Monitoring Officer
Joanna Morley	Interim Governance Officer

*denotes attendance via Zoom

1. Apologies for absence

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Cllrs Harvey, Ven de Weyer, Miscandlon and Smith. Cllr Fane attended as a substitute for Cllr Harvey.

2. Declarations of Interest

- 2.1 No declarations of interest were made.

3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting and Action Log

- 3.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 10 January 2023 were approved as a correct record and the Action Log was noted.

4. Public Questions

- 4.1 There were no public questions.

---o0o---

The Chair declared that item 7, the Demand Responsive Transport report, would be moved to the end of the agenda in case there was a need to go into private session.

---o0o---

5. Improvement Framework

- 5.1 Gordon Mitchell, Interim Chief Executive introduced the report which provided the Overview and Scrutiny Committee with an opportunity to undertake pre-scrutiny of the Improvement Framework report going to Board on the 25 January.

- 5.2 During discussion the following points were noted:

- a. On reviewing the new Governance arrangements that form part of the Improvement Plan, the Committee highlighted the need for Overview and Scrutiny to be fully integrated with the new Committee structure, and for Members to be fully engaged and informed.
- b. In order to fulfil a developing role, the information provided to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee needed to be much more timely. The move to a Forward Plan giving up to six months' notice of items of business was welcomed and would aid the Committee to look ahead for priority strands of work.
- c. There was concern about the possible risk of non-alignment of the LTCP with emerging Government guidance and although officers allayed concerns to a degree and stated that there were unlikely to be any surprises, the Board would need to be mindful of Governmental delays impacting the pace of the Improvement Plan's implementation in this regard.
- d. The Mayoral ambition statement and the CA's Corporate Strategy needed to be triangulated with the objectives of Government as without this alignment there was a danger that the funding to deliver projects would not be forthcoming.
- e. Given the focus on the Bus Strategy, more realistic timescales for bus franchising needed to be set. The Chief Executive outlined to Members that in two years' time the CPCA could be at the point of agreeing the business case for franchising but then there would need to be another period of time to implement plans and put in place the considerable number of staff that would be needed. The Chief Executive also referenced the need to factor in any unforeseen financial risk should the bus franchising operation not go to plan. This could further delay decision making or potentially derail the project if this underwriting of financial risk was not accepted by the CPCA. It was felt that this detail and nuance was not coming through in reports and documents
- f. The Committee noted the number of amber ratings in the report and would ask Board Members to consider whether they were content that these were just due

to a change of scope and more realistic timelines, or whether there were any other issues that should be of concern.

RESOLVED:

1. That the comments, as outlined above, be given as feedback to the Board ahead of their meeting on 25 January 2023.

ACTIONS:

1. The Governance officer to circulate the draft feedback to all Members for their approval before publication with the Board agenda papers.

6. Local Transport and Connectivity Plan

- 6.1 Tim Bellamy, Interim Head of Transport introduced the report which provided the Committee with an update on the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP), specifically in relation to the DfT guideline deadlines, and progress to date.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- a. Members felt that the number of responses to the consultation was low and therefore wanted assurance that special interest and bias had been eliminated as far as possible.
- b. There appeared to be a lack of input from car drivers and expressions of interest in electrification and car-sharing for example, and much more emphasis on climate change and cycling.
- c. Officers confirmed that in addition to the public consultation events there had also been public engagement with the third sector, regional businesses and main employers to understand their views. Concerns such as freight delivery and car travel had been highlighted in the focus groups and would be taken into consideration.
- d. The Alternative Fuel Strategy consultation included looking at where electric charging points should be sited.
- e. Individuals had to declare whether they had special interests and were acting on behalf of a special interest group or organisation.
- f. It was interesting to note that of those that agreed or strongly agreed with the proposed local area strategy the highest response (45%) came from Greater Cambridge. However, this belied the fact that if the disagree and strongly disagree figures were added together, the area of strongest disagreement was also Greater Cambridge at 30%. It would have been useful for these figures to be set against each other to see what the balance was.
- g. It was also difficult to tell what 'agree with' and 'disagree with' meant. For example, some respondents might have felt that the plans were terrible and should stop whilst there may have been others who were disappointed that it was not being done fast enough and therefore a lot more of it should be done. Both were counted as disagreements but from completely different perspectives.
- h. Young people had not engaged with the consultation as much as other age groups and therefore their concerns regarding access to skills, education and training were perhaps underrepresented. Officers had been liaising with the Skills Director to understand how young people's views on these matters could be sought.

RESOLVED:

That the Committee:

1. Note the update on the local Transport and Connectivity Plan, specifically in relation to the DfT guidelines deadlines.

ACTIONS:

1. Transport officers to provide members with the following:
 - Details of the number and type of special interest declarations.
 - More detail on the pie-chart representations of the 'agree' and 'disagree' categories.
 - An update on how the concerns of young people, in regard to transport to access training and education, were being addressed.
2. The Transport Manager would work with the Monitoring Officer to provide a timeframe for when the final version of the LTCP would come before the Committee.

7. Budget Scrutiny – Responses to the Consultation

Jon Alsop, Chief Finance Officer, introduced this item which previewed the 2023/24 Budget and Medium-Term Financial Plan 2023-2027 report going to Board at their meeting on 25 January, including a summary of budget and MTFP Consultation feedback and responses.

7.1 During discussion the following points were noted:

1. The final number of responses to the consultation was 690, details of which were set out in appendix 3 of the CA Board report.
2. If the decision to impose the Mayoral precept was made by the CA Board at their meeting on 25 January then this would allow enough time for officers to advise constituent authorities and for them to set up measures for collection. Difficulties would arise if the precept was challenged, or the budget failed in any way.
3. The increase to the amount of Transport Levy charged, which was payable by the area's Local Highways Authorities (Peterborough City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council) had been capped by the inflation figure of the previous September. The 2% charged by the CPCA was in line with other Combined Authorities. If this figure was increased it would push the burden onto the two Highways Authorities who would likely recoup the costs in other ways, for example through council tax.
4. There was no specific contingency for non-collection of the mayoral precept; instead it would be considered as part of the overall minimum revenue reserve that was built into the budget at 4.5% of total gross expenditure.
5. As part of the Improvement Plan and a move to a new structure, Mayoral staff now reported into the Chief Executive team so their costs were included in this figure.

RESOLVED:

That the responses to the Consultation be noted.

8. Combined Authority Forward Plan

- 8.1 Cllr Atkins, Lead Member for Climate, asked Members to note that the CA Board would be considering a business case to support a meanwhile project at Core Site in Cambridge City. This was a £1m capital project to support a community space focussed on enabling groups of visitors tackling climate change to do so effectively.
- 8.2 In addition, at the CA Board's March meeting a climate annual report would be presented. Cllr Atkins suggested that Overview and Scrutiny Members might wish to informally discuss this at their February meeting.

9. Combined Authority Board Agenda

- 9.1 Members did not put forward any questions to be asked at the CA Board meeting on 25 January 2023 but as noted in item 5, resolved that their comments on the Improvement Plan be fed back to the Board.

10. Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the draft work programme as shown at Appendix1 be noted.
- 2. That in place of a formal public meeting that the reserve February date be used for an informal discussion on the role, functioning and priorities of the Committee.

11. Demand Responsive Transport

- 11.1 Tim Bellamy, Interim Head of Transport introduced the report which provided an update on the Combined Authority's use of Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) and the Ting trial in particular.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- a. The consultation on the draft Bus Strategy was launched on Friday 20 January and would last for six weeks; its findings would be fed back to the Committee.
- b. Officers commented on the report submitted by Cllr Hay regarding bus services to October's Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting and clarified that the CA still awaited a formal written response to the Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) from the Department for Transport (DfT).
- c. Councillors asked officers for more information about a map that had been included within Cambridgeshire County Council's last full Council papers and which showed where Dial a Ride services would operate. Officers were not familiar with this mapping exercise but would investigate and report back to the Committee.
- d. The Bus and Transport team would be conducting a thorough review of the whole network to see if there was a way of delivering services that would make better use of resources. This would investigate what the right mix was in terms of passenger cost per journey and explore the use of less conventional services in some areas and expanding the use of DRT.

- e. The review, as well as looking at cost, would consider reliability, punctuality and accessibility.
- f. Costs per journey were expected to fall in subsequent years as a result of operational and driver improvements as well as an increasing number of people accessing the service.
- g. Officers would be assessing the demand responsive transport operating in other areas to see what lessons could be learnt.
- h. Officers would provide the Committee with the details of any section 106 contributions from local county or district councils to see how the cost per journey figures of the different services were affected.
- i. Councillors commented that a better metric to have given for performance information, as outlined in para 2.23 of the report, would have been for how quickly 75 to 80% of passengers were picked up.
- j. The younger generation had enthusiastically taken up DRT whereas the older demographic sometimes had difficulty using the app and also liked the certainty of a scheduled bus.
- k. Bus operators had commented that they were still struggling to get older bus passengers back after covid.
- l. Cross operator ticketing was being discussed with operators and the ultimate aim would be to build this service into one single point of access app in order to make taking the bus as easy as possible.

RESOLVED:

That the Committee:

- 1. Note the update on the Combined Authority's use of Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) and the Ting trial in particular.

ACTIONS:

Transport officers to:

- 1. Investigate the Dial-A-Ride mapping exercise, referred to at a CCC meeting, and report back to the Committee.
- 2. Provide the Committee with the details of any section 106 contributions to DRT services.

12. Date of next meeting

12.1 Monday, 20 March 2023 at 11am.

Meeting Closed: 1.16 pm