



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE  
& PETERBOROUGH**  
COMBINED AUTHORITY

### Agenda Item 3.2 Appendix 1: Overview & Scrutiny Feedback to the CA Board

On consideration of the Highlight Report at its meeting on Monday 23 January, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee wish to submit the following feedback:

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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

6. 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.