



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE  
& PETERBOROUGH**  
COMBINED AUTHORITY

## **OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**Date: Monday, 28 June 2021**

**Democratic Services**

Robert Parkin Dip. LG.  
Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer

**11:00 AM**

72 Market Street  
Ely  
Cambridgeshire  
CB7 4LS

**Main Hall, Burgess Hall Events and Conference Centre,  
One Leisure, Westwood Road, St Ives PE27 6WU  
[Venue Address]**

## **AGENDA**

**Open to Public and Press**

- 1 Apologies for Absence**
- 2 Election of Chair**
- 3 Election of Vice Chair**
- 4 Declarations of Interest**

At this point Members must declare whether they have a disclosable pecuniary interest, or other interest, in any of the items on the agenda, unless it is already entered in the register of members' interests.

|           |   |                  |
|-----------|---|------------------|
| <b>5</b>  | <b>Minutes of the Previous Meeting</b><br>To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 22nd March 2021<br><b>O&amp;S Draft Minutes 220321</b>  | <b>5 - 18</b>    |
| <b>6</b>  | <b>Public Questions</b><br>Arrangements for public questions can be viewed in Chapter 5, Paragraphs 18 to 18.16 of the Constitution which can be viewed here - <a href="#">Cambs-Pboro-CA-Constitution-1.pdf (kinstacdn.com)</a>      |                  |
| <b>7</b>  | <b>Appointment of Lead Members</b><br>To nominate and appoint members to the roles of lead members to CPCA Executive Committees and Business Board<br><b>Item 7 - Appointment Lead members Report</b>                                 | <b>19 - 26</b>   |
| <b>8</b>  | <b>Co-opted Independent Member</b><br>To consider the co-option of an independent member (and substitute) from a constituent council.<br><b>Item 8 Co-opted Independent Member report</b>   | <b>27 - 56</b>   |
| <b>9</b>  | <b>Centre for Governance and Scrutiny Update</b><br><br><b>Item 9 - Review O&amp;S Arrangements - CfGS Recc</b>   | <b>57 - 66</b>   |
| <b>10</b> | <b>Combined Authority Board Agenda</b><br>The Committee to review the Combined Authority Board Agenda published 22nd June 2021. <a href="#">CMIS &gt; Meetings</a>  |                  |
| <b>11</b> | <b>Combined Authority Forward Plan</b><br>Members allocated to monitor the activities of the Combined Authority to provide a verbal update to the committee on any areas of interest.<br><b>Item 11 - Forward Plan - 17 June 2021</b> | <b>67 - 134</b>  |
| <b>12</b> | <b>Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme</b>   |                  |
| <b>13</b> | <b>Date of next meeting:</b><br>Monday, 26th July 2021 at 11.00 a.m.<br><b>Item 12 - Work Programme</b>   | <b>135 - 138</b> |

The Overview & Scrutiny Committee comprises the following members:

*For more information about this meeting, including access arrangements and facilities for people with disabilities, please contact*

The Combined Authority is committed to open government and members of the public are welcome to attend Committee meetings. It supports the principle of transparency and encourages filming, recording and taking photographs at meetings that are open to the public. It also welcomes the use of social networking and micro-blogging websites (such as Twitter and Facebook) to communicate with people about what is happening, as it happens.

Councillor Dave Baigent

Councillor Andy Coles

Councillor Stephen Corney

Councillor Mike Davey

Councillor Doug Dew

Councillor Lorna Dupre

Councillor Peter Fane

Councillor Mark Goldsack

Councillor Anne Hay

Councillor Alex Miscandlon

Councillor Edna Murphy

Councillor Shaz Nawaz

Councillor Judith Rippeth

Councillor Alan Sharp

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Clerk Name:      | Anne Gardiner  |
| Clerk Telephone: |  |
| Clerk Email:     | <a href="mailto:anne.gardiner@cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk">anne.gardiner@cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk</a> |





**CAMBRIDGESHIRE  
& PETERBOROUGH**  
COMBINED AUTHORITY

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

### **DRAFT MINUTES**

**Date: Monday, 22 March 2021**

**Time: 11.00 a.m.**

**Location: Virtual Meeting via the Zoom Platform**

#### **Present:**

|                      |                                       |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Cllr P Jordan        | Huntingdonshire District Council      |
| Cllr S Corney        | Huntingdonshire District Council      |
| Cllr L Dupre (Chair) | East Cambridgeshire District Council  |
| Cllr A Sharp         | East Cambridgeshire District Council  |
| Cllr M Gehring       | Cambridge City Council                |
| Cllr M Davey         | Cambridge City Council                |
| Cllr J Scutt         | Cambridgeshire County Council         |
| Cllr A Coles         | Peterborough City Council             |
| Cllr E Murphy        | Peterborough City Council             |
| Cllr A Miscandlon    | Fenland District Council              |
| Cllr A Hay           | Fenland District Council              |
| Cllr P Fane          | South Cambridgeshire District Council |
| Cllr G Chamberlain   | South Cambridgeshire District Council |

#### **Officers:**

|                |  |
|----------------|--|
| Robert Parkin  | Chief Legal and Monitoring Officer, Combined Authority |
| Paul Raynes    | Director for Delivery and Strategy                     |
| John T Hill    | Director for Business and Skills                       |
| Patrick White  | Partner, Metrodynamics                                 |
| Adrian Cannard | Strategic Planning Manager                             |
| Roberta Fulton | Programme Manager                                      |
| Anne Gardiner  | Scrutiny Officer                                       |

Also in attendance: Baroness Brown

#### **1. Apologies for Absence**

- 1.1 Apologies were received from: Cllr D Connor, no substitution.
- 1.2 The Scrutiny Officer conducted the rollcall of Committee attendees.

#### **2. Declarations of Interest**

- 2.1 No declarations of interest were made.

### **3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

- 3.1 The minutes of the previous meeting held on Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2021 were agreed as an accurate record.

### **4. Public Questions**

- 4.1 There were no public questions.

### **5. Independent Commission on Climate Change**

- 5.1 The Committee welcomed Baroness Brown and thanked her for attending to introduce the recently published report from the commission.
- 5.2 Baroness Brown made a statement which outlined the key issues raised within the report and is summarised below:

The Commission had been surprised with the outcomes which showed that the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area had emissions that were 25% above the rest of the UK and these emissions were falling more slowly than the UK average.

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough was an area at high risk of climate change, with possible 40-degree temperatures by the 2050's, summer droughts and flooding increasing by 16% if no action was taken.

It was urgent that action was taken as the area would have run out of the allowance of emissions in 6 year's time.

The interim report highlighted key areas; these were:

- 1) Transport – emissions were 50% higher per head and 3 times the rate of increase than the UK average. HGV emissions was more than double national average.
- 2) Housing – as Cambridgeshire and Peterborough was an area where there would be an increase in the building of homes it had been important to focus on this however, this area was slightly better than the UK average.
- 3) Energy system and water, more information would be provided on this area in the final report.
- 4) Peat

There was a significant task ahead which would require funding to the amount of £700m per annum to address issues. The benefits though would be the opportunity to have a region which had better homes, green spaces, better jobs, better health, and wellbeing.

The Chair opened the floor to members to ask questions and the following points were discussed.

- 5.7 The biggest challenge faced would be the introduction of low carbon heating with 350,000 houses needing to be converted. This would be the area where the Baroness felt that there would be the most resistance and a lot of effort would

need to be made to ensure communication with residents was clear on what they could do and the benefits associated with this.

Low carbon heating would have the biggest upfront cost and the slowest payback which would be difficult for many to accept.

The other major challenge with low carbon heating was to get the skills needed to deliver and advise on this.

The starting point would be for housing associations to introduce this.

Farmers were already facing insecurities from the change from the Common Agricultural Policy to the new ELMS scheme along with challenges to being able to export. Suggestions on wetting peat and the moving of farmland for the growth of trees would feel like an additional threat on top of difficulties already being faced by the sector. It would therefore be very important to engage with the farming community to ensure they understood how they could still operate successfully and earn a productive living from the land.

- 5.8 Baroness Brown advised that the Fens BioSphere vision aligned with the important issues raised within the report.

Baroness Brown had some concerns about the Cambridgeshire Decarbonisation Fund as she felt that the focus on offsetting as a funding option rather than encouraging people into taking actions could provide the wrong impression. If actions were also being taken it could be a useful way to raise funding. Baroness Brown said she would like to see the Combined Authority use its role to utilise financial instruments such as Green Funds to help provide funding to local house builders.

- 5.9 In response to a question on the significant costs of retrofitting Baroness Brown advised that social housing would be a good place to start and that a strong financial team at the CPCA would be needed to look at what financial instruments could be used to leverage initiatives from central government.

- 5.10 In response to a question on the ambition set out in the report on buses to be run on electricity or hydrogen by 2030, Baroness Brown advised that as an area we would need to move quickly to achieve this and key to achieving this would be to appoint a Climate Cabinet to ensure there was a common vision amongst the key players involved in the area.

- 5.11 In response to a question on climate change assessments and whether these should have always been part of transport and housing project assessments the committee were advised that this would be discussed at the CA Board with a view that officers would be tasked to develop an implementation plan. Baroness Brown advised that the Commission were keen that all investments should be considered in the context of considering the vision of the future.

In response to a question on the emphasis on road building at the CPCA Baroness Brown advised that all plans and procurements should have climate change assessments carried out to see if a reduction in road building was achievable but more analysis in this area was required.

- 5.12 In response to a question on how surface water was affected by development of new roads and pavements Baroness Brown advised that this was an important point to be considered and that there were ways to get around that by using

effective methods of development; this would be considered in more depth in the commissions next report.

Green spaces would play an important role in helping with climate change; nature would be focused on in more detail in the commissions next report, but it was recognised that green spaces in new developments were very important.

- 5.13 In response to a question on transferring tariffs Baroness Brown agreed that this was something that needed to be looked at by central government in particular to consider reviewing the tax on fuels so that those on electricity sources can benefit from a more cost-effective system; integrating those systems would be important.
- 5.14 In response to a question regarding how much impact change by individuals can make when there are wider national issues regarding climate change, Baroness Brown advised that it was important that change had to happen in every household in every region. In a survey undertaken it evidenced that residents for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough were keen to play their part and would welcome more education and communication on the issues.
- 5.15 In response to a question about how rural areas can achieve lower mileages as outlined in the report, Baroness Brown advised that she recognised that the lower mileage goal may not be achievable for some areas and that to lower emissions in those areas the focus would need to be on low emission vehicles.
- 5.16 In response to a question on the Peat Land Investigation timeline; Baroness Brown advised that it might not take 5 years, but it was important to get the right information to feed into the national study which would take place in 2023 and that there was at least three years of work to be done.
- 5.17 The Chair thanked Baroness Brown for attending the meeting and answering the committee's questions.

## **6. Covid 19 Impact Update**

- 6.1 The Committee received the report from the Director for Business and Skills which provided the Overview & Scrutiny Committee with an update on COVID-19 and the response from the Business Board to enhance local economic recovery work in Cambridgeshire & Peterborough.
- 6.2 The Director for Business and Skills introduced Patrick White from Metrodynamics who provided an update to the committee outlining the following points.
- We now have much more information on the impact of Covid 19 on the economy of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and have received in depth feedback from local organisations and councils.
  - The recovery strategy is a live document that would be continually updated as the situation changed; there had been many changes since November and there would continue to be changes; this was important to note.
  - It was important that there was clarity about the need and opportunity in the different parts of the area as all parts must be supported but in different ways as they had all been affected by the pandemic in different ways.



- Important to emphasize how big a role different parts of the Cambridgeshire local economy have to play in securing a zero carbon goal; therefore the context facing businesses is changing very rapidly.
- Intervention was focused on skills and retraining this was important as it would allow business and individuals to adapt and deal with the changes upcoming. Currently there was uncertainty around what capital investment would be required in five years so the report set out actions; some were immediate and some looked at 22/23 period to consider actions required to enable levelling up funding to be applied for.
- It was difficult to tell whether issues arising were a direct result of Brexit or Covid 19 and it was too early to analyse this but the officer hoped that by late May or June analysis could be carried out.
- The real impact on employment had been masked by the furlough scheme but it did appear that unemployment had risen especially for young people and women however, it was difficult to draw any firm conclusions at this time.

6.3 In response to a question about the interventions the committee were advised that the team had put more effort into coming up with short term programmes which would get young people into skills and training.

The team were in the process of building a bid which was hoped would be between £1.5-2m and would be about engaging young people who have been affected and others who had been displaced to get them into jobs or education which would lead to jobs – this was a very intensive and quick process.

The Combined Authority had put £4m into capital grants but the team were also preparing a bid for an Entrepreneur Start Up grant as some people may not get another job but may start up a business.

In response to a follow up question about the Entrepreneur Start Up Grant the committee were advised that the strategy for targeting companies had shifted towards focussing on female led businesses, hospitality, and care businesses. It had been recognised that businesses with female board representation were more likely to scale up and this is what the team would be looking for.

6.4 In response to a question about the use of concrete for building the first building at the University of Peterborough, the committee were advised that this university had a 50% higher off campus learning percentage than other universities, at any one time there would be less than half of the students on campus. This was a very remote model for a university. The first building on the new campus had capacity to train 3000 graduates but physically present at one time would only be 300. The building had been leveraged to balance out the amount of concrete used.

6.5 The Committee were advised that the second wave of Covid 19 had hit the area harder and that it would be focusing on areas such as Fenland where the need was greatest; the impact had been worse where people had already been suffering from low wages and in work poverty. The Communities Renewal Fund would be helping to support a manufacturing cluster in Fenland which could be expanded upon.

6.6 The Committee thanked the officers and noted the report.

## **7. CAM Task and Finish Group Update**

- 7.1 The Committee received the report which provided an update on the work of the CAM Task and Finish Group.
- 7.2 Cllr Gehring noted that there was an error in the report and requested that East/West Rail was added in.
- 7.3 The Committee RESOLVED to:
  - a) Note the update from the Task and Finish Group
  - b) Close the Task and Finish group as it currently stands
  - c) Approve that a new CAM Task and Finish group with an updated Terms of Reference be created by the new committee post-election.

## **8. Combined Authority Project Register**

- 8.1 The Committee received the report from the Programme Manager which provided the Committee with an overview of the Combined Authority projects.
- 8.2 In response to some questions about information relating to the Housing programmes the committee were advised that the report was based on the February highlight reports and would be updated following the March highlight reports to reflect any changes that have come about over the past few weeks
- 8.3 In response to a question about administration costs for projects and the costs of climate assessments needing to be introduced the officer agreed to provide Cllr Murphy with a breakdown of the management and administration costs for the projects and what the potential cost would be to carry out climate assessments for each project.
- 8.4 In response to a question about the completion date for One CAM project and the Outline Business Case, the officer agreed to provide some additional information regarding where the CAM project sat either with the CAM or with the Combined Authority to Cllr Gehring and what the completion date would be.
- 8.5 The officer agreed to provide an explanation on the movement of the RAG rating on two projects: the March Junction Improvements and the Wisbech Access Strategy to Cllr Sharp.
- 8.6 The Committee thanked the officer for the improved format provided and noted the report.

## **9. Combined Authority Board Agenda**

- 9.1 The Committee reviewed the Combined Authority Board agenda and agreed that the Chair should ask the following questions on behalf of the committee at the CA Board meeting on 24 March 2021.

### Item 2.2 Financial Strategies 2021-2022

- 1) What plans does the Combined Authority have to move towards decarbonising its investments?
- 2) What can be done to adopt for the purposes of existing projects the Climate Commission's recommendation that climate assessments should

be undertaken for Combined Authority projects, and what financial impact would this have?

#### Item 3.1 CAM Progress Report

- 3) Please will the Combined Authority provide comparative data for Chief Executive and other senior officer remuneration packages for other projects similar to CAM?
- 4) In regard to the performance related pay could the criteria that will be used to assess the CEO and other senior staff be provided to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee?
- 5) Can the Combined Authority provide the Overview & Scrutiny Committee with confirmation of funding currently in place for CAM, and the security of the funding for entire project?

#### Item 3.6 Independent Commission on Climate Change - Interim report

- 6) At a meeting of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee on 28 October 2019, the Mayor declined to declare a climate emergency when invited by the Committee to do so. Has the interim report of the Climate Commission affected his view on this?
- 7) The Climate Commission report recommends that a Climate Cabinet is set up. How open and transparent will this Climate Cabinet be? Will it meet in public? Will members of the public and of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee have access to its papers? How does the Combined Authority Board intend to prioritise the recommendations in the report?
- 8) How will the Climate Commission and the Combined Authority Board engage with key stakeholders especially the farming community to ensure there is good communication around the issue of peat outlined within the Commission's report?

#### Item 5.1 £100M Affordable Housing Programme

- 9) The Combined Authority agreement and the business case indicates that the authority was to seek funding to supplement the funding received from government for the £100m Affordable Housing programme. What steps have been taken by the Combined Authority in accordance with this requirement? Could a list of these be provided with dates and the outcome and the levels of funding secured?
- 10) The recommendations refer to the 'completion' of the £100m Affordable Housing Programme. Does the Board believe that the programme will be 'completed', ie with £100m received and 2,000 homes delivered by March 2022?
- 11) Could the CA Board give (a) a best and (b) a worst case scenario for (i) the total amount of money received for affordable housing outside Cambridge by March 2022 and (ii) the total number of homes that will be built with that money?

9.2 The responses received are attached at Appendix 1.

#### **10. Lead Member Questions to Executive Committees**

10.1 The Committee received and noted the report.

#### **11. Combined Authority Forward Plan**

11.1 The Committee received and noted the Combined Authority Forward Plan.

## **12. Overview and Scrutiny Arrangements Review**

12.1 The Committee received the report which provided the proposal from the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny to carry out a review of the current scrutiny arrangements at the CPCA.

12.2 The Committee **RESOLVED:**

a) Agree that the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny carry out a review of the scrutiny arrangements for the CPCA.

b) request that the CA Board approve that the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny carry out a review of the current scrutiny arrangements at the CPCA.

## **13. Date of Next Meeting**

13.1 The next meeting would be held on the 28<sup>th</sup> June 2021.

The Chair advised that an informal meet and greet and induction session would be arranged in early June.

13.2 The Chair thanked members and officers for their hard work on the committee this year.

The Committee members thanked the Chair for her hard work in running the committee.

The meeting closed at: 13:05pm

## Appendix 1

### Questions from O&S to the CPCA Board 24 March 2021

#### Item 2.2 Financial Strategies 2021/22

- 1) What plans does the Combined Authority have to move towards decarbonising its investments?

*A: The Board is being asked to consider its response to the recommendations of the Climate Change Commission in a later item on this agenda. Officers will consider how the Board's responses to those recommendations may inform future investment decision making. Officers will then take advice from our treasury advisors on how best to meet the Board's recommendations in the drafting of future financial strategies.*

- 2) What can be done to adopt for the purposes of existing projects the Climate Commission's recommendation that climate assessments should be undertaken for Combined Authority projects, and what financial impact would this have?

*A: The Board is being invited at this meeting to agree to bring forward a costed detailed action plan to implement the Climate Change Commission's recommendations. The recommendation on climate assessments will be addressed and costed as part of that exercise. The direct financial impact of climate assessments would probably be negligible. Its indirect financial effect would be to ensure that all projects' budgets reflected appropriate measures to meet the 2050 net zero target.*

#### 3.1 CAM Progress Report March 2021

- 3) Please will the Combined Authority provide comparative data for Chief Executive and other senior officer remuneration packages for other projects similar to CAM?

*A: During the initial stages of the search for the CEO of One Cam a number of suitable candidates from a wide range of similar organisation were considered for long listing. These organisations included Thames Tideway, Crossrail, HS2 and TFL. The average*

*salary expectations of those on the long list was £255,000 per annum plus an average bonus of 30%. The short list was selected based on experience and capability to deliver the project and their average salary expectation was £288,000 plus an average bonus of 45%. A number of other candidates working inside and outside of the UK were also initially considered, but salary expectations significantly exceeded our budget.*

- 4) In regard to the performance related pay could the criteria that will be used to assess the CEO and other senior staff be provided to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee?

*A: The performance of the CEO and other senior staff will be assessed by the One CAM Board in relation to the achievement of One CAM Limited annual objectives which will be set out in the Business Plan. The Business Plan is a requirement of the Shareholder Agreement and is being developed now; it will be submitted to the Combined Authority Board in June. The senior staff performance assessment process and annual outcome will be made available to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.*

- 5) Can the Combined Authority provide the Overview & Scrutiny Committee with confirmation of funding currently in place for CAM, and the security of the funding for entire project?

*A: The Overview and Scrutiny Committee will be aware that the Board approved the Medium-Term Financial Plan at its January meeting. The plan earmarked capital funding of £2m to support the activities of One CAM limited in 2021/22, and a further £5m in 2021/22, £6.5m in 2022/23 and £6.5m in 2023/24 to support the development of the CAM Business Case. These earmarked allocations being 'subject to approval' by the Combined Authority Board. The Funding and Financing Delivery Strategy for the CAM is currently being drafted which will appraise the options for securing the necessary funding going forward.*

### 3.6 Independent Commission on Climate Change: Interim Report

- 6) At a meeting of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee on 28 October 2019, the Mayor declined to declare a climate emergency when invited by the Committee to do so. Has the interim report of the Climate Commission affected his view on this?

*A: On the contrary, the interim report provides practical and definite recommendations about how to meet the 2050 net zero target which the Board will now be taking forward. This is a great deal better than declaring an emergency without having a plan. Deliverable measures are infinitely more useful than rhetoric.*

- 7) The Climate Commission report recommends that a Climate Cabinet is set up. How open and transparent will this Climate Cabinet be? Will it meet in public? Will members of the public and of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee have access to its papers? How does the Combined Authority Board intend to prioritise the recommendations in the report?

*A: The Board is being invited to agree that the steps needed to set up a Climate Cabinet will be taken and that officers will bring forward a detailed proposal. That proposal will cover the issues in the first three questions. The Board is also being invited at this meeting to agree to bring forward a costed detailed action plan to implement the Climate Change Commission's recommendations. That plan will address the fourth question, about prioritisation.*

- 8) How will the Climate Commission and the Combined Authority Board engage with key stakeholders especially the farming community to ensure there is good communication around the issue of peat outlined within the Commission's report?

*A: It is vital that policy on peatlands is made on the basis of a much stronger evidence base than is available to policymakers at the moment. There are very significant gaps in the data on peat, and very significant gaps in understanding of the effects of different farming methods. Fen farmers and other members of the Fen community must be given the lead role in developing a robust evidence base before government decisions are made. The Board is being invited at this meeting to accept the Commission's recommendation to establish a Fenland Peat Committee. That group will engage with key stakeholders and especially the farming community to ensure their voices are heard and their evidence taken on board by government as it develops policy about peatlands.*

#### 5.1 £100M Affordable Housing Programme

- 9) The Combined Authority agreement and the business case indicates that the authority was to seek funding to supplement the funding received from government for the £100m Affordable Housing programme. What steps have been taken by the

Combined Authority in accordance with this requirement? Could a list of these be provided with dates and the outcome and the levels of funding secured?

*A: The Combined Authority supported the successful £219m Housing Infrastructure Fund investment – a HIF - for the Cambridge North East Fringe scheme. It also supported an initial HIF application for the Wisbech garden village project, which has positioned the project for an application for a future round of HIF, if and when the Government releases a further funding round. We have also raised the profile of the 500 unit scheme at Kennett with Government, to position that for any available future housing funding support.*

10)The recommendations refer to the 'completion' of the £100m Affordable Housing Programme. Does the Board believe that the programme will be 'completed', ie with £100m received and 2,000 homes delivered by March 2022?

*A: We cannot predict what will happen in the next 12 months. Clearly, we will endeavour to deliver the maximum number of units possible. Up to the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2021 there have been 733 housing starts with £26.1m of grant money committed. The programme for 2021/ 22 already has 782 units approved with a further £31.8m of grant being required. There are then additional 'new' opportunities to be captured with the support of MHCLG from our housing pipeline over the next 12 months. So, we are confident we can reach 2,000 homes, but we can't give an absolute guarantee because we cannot predict what the economy is going to do and what the delivery of housing will be over the next 12 months.*

11)Could the CA Board give (a) a best and (b) a worst case scenario for (i) the total amount of money received for affordable housing outside Cambridge by March 2022 and (ii) the total number of homes that will be built with that money?

*A: Discussions are ongoing with MHCLG as to how the housing programme will progress in its new form. There are already 733 housing starts and the CPCA has a further 782 units pre-approved by the Housing and Communities Committee to progress to start on site during the period April 2021 to March 2022 with a further £31.8m of grant being required. Then there are additional new opportunities to be captured with the support of MHCLG from within our housing pipeline over the next twelve months. That leaves a further 485 units to be delivered and we feel that with the support of MHCLG those opportunities will come forward in the next*



*twelve months. What we can't guarantee is what the economy will be doing and what effect Covid will have during that period of time.*



Agenda Item No: 7

## Report title: Appointment of Lead Members

To: Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Meeting Date: 28 June 2021

Public report: Yes

From: Rochelle Tapping  
Deputy Monitoring Officer

Recommendations: The Overview & Scrutiny Committee is recommended to

a) Nominate and appoint members to the roles of Lead Members for the Housing, Skills and the Transport & Infrastructure Committees and the Business Board

Voting arrangements: A simple majority of all Members

### 1. Purpose

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to ask the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to consider nominations for the Lead Member Roles to shadow the work of the Housing, Skills and Transport Committee and the Business Board.

### 2. Background

- 2.1 Under the governance arrangements, effective from 1 November 2019, decision making is now distributed between the Combined Authority Board and the Executive Committees. There are three Executive Committees, Skills, Housing & Communities and Transport Infrastructure. The single Forward Plan sets out both key and non-key decisions and allocates the decision making between the Combined Authority Board and the Executive Committees.



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE  
& PETERBOROUGH**  
COMBINED AUTHORITY

- 2.2 In October 2019 the Committee considered how to scrutinise the work of the executive Committees and agreed members of the Committee to lead in respect of the work of each of the Executive Committees.
- 2.3 A role description for Lead Members was approved by the committee in January 2020. The remit of the lead Member role involves reviewing the Forward Plan in relation to the Executive Committee together with the published agendas and reports with a view to identifying issues which might warrant further scrutiny, the asking of questions on behalf of the Committee at meetings of the relevant Executive Committee and potentially identifying decisions which would warrant the exercise of call-in powers. (Role Description is at Appendix 1)

### **Business Board Lead Member**

- 2.4 In August 2020 the Committee agreed that given the importance of the Business Board in relation to the Covid-19 recovery as well as the local economy in general and the dispersal of funds, a Lead Member should be appointed to shadow the Business Board. At its meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2020 the Overview and Scrutiny Committee met with Austen Adams, the Chair of the Business Board and discussed how the committee would like to appoint a Lead Member to shadow the Business Board; this was agreed and a role description (Appendix 2) was approved by the Committee in February and recommended to the Business Board and CA Board for approval.
- 2.5 The Committee are requested to agree the lead members for:
- Housing and Communities Committee
  - Transport and Infrastructure Committee
  - Skills Committee
  - Business Board

Consideration should be given to ensure political and geographical representation across the committee.

## **3. Financial Implications**

- 3.1 In accordance with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Order 2017, no remuneration is to be payable by the Combined Authority to its members including Lead Members of the Overview and Committee.

## **4. Legal Implications**

- 4.1 Lead members appointments should reflect the political balance and geographical make-up of the Committee to ensure a balanced view, in so far as this is possible.



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE  
& PETERBOROUGH**  
COMBINED AUTHORITY

## 5. Appendices

Appendix 1 – Role Description of Lead Members

Appendix 2 – Role Description of Lead Member for the Business Board

## 6. Background Papers

6.1 [O&S Agenda & Minutes – July 2020](#)

6.2 [O&S Report – Lead Members January 2020](#)

6.3 [O&S Agenda & Minutes November 2020](#)

6.4 [O&S Agenda & Minutes February 2021](#)

6.5 [Business Board – 4<sup>th</sup> March 2021](#)

6.6 [CA Board Report – March 2021](#)



## **Appendix 1**

### **Role Description -Lead Member for Executive Committee**

#### **Background**

Under new governance arrangements, effective from 1 November 2019, decision making is now distributed between the Combined Authority Board and the Executive Committees. There are three Executive Committees, Skills, Housing & Communities and Transport & Infrastructure. The single Forward Plan sets out both key and non-key decisions and allocates the decision making between the Combined Authority Board and the Executive Committees. With significant decisions being taken by the Executive Committees, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (O&S) has a role in scrutinising the work of those Committees. In order to do so, appointed members of O&S will lead in respect of the work of each Executive Committee. These members will occupy the position of Lead Members.

#### **Role Title**

Lead Member for Executive Committees

#### **Role Purpose**

To scrutinise the work of the Executive Committee, adopting an independent mindset

#### **Role Criteria**

- Political balance and geographic location of Lead Members should, where possible, demonstrate a balanced view

#### **Role description**

- To scrutinise decisions
- Reviewing the Forward Plan, agendas and reports of the Executive Committee, identifying issues which require further scrutiny
- Formulating draft wording for questions to the relevant Executive Committee, seeking the agreement of the Chair of O&S, where possible
- Questioning the relevant Executive Committee on behalf of O&S, allowing questions to be submitted in writing and for written responses
- In consultation with the Chair of O&S, consideration of recommendations required in relation to decisions of the relevant Executive Committee
- Making reports or recommendations to O&S regarding decisions made by the relevant Executive Committee
- Identifying decisions which require the exercise of 'call-in' powers via reconsideration
- Liaising with officers of the Combined Authority, to enable the Lead Member to undertake his/her duties





## **Appendix 1**

### **Role Description for Overview and Scrutiny Lead Member for the Business Board**

#### **Background**

The Business Board is the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) for the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough region whose accountable body is the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority.

Key Roles of the Business Board:

- ❖ The Business Board is the custodian and plays a vital leadership role in the development of the Local Industrial Strategy.
- ❖ It allocates local growth funds to improve economic opportunity in the area and will monitor the delivery of funded projects.
- ❖ The Business Board develops initiatives to address the local skills challenges and will play a key role in developing the University of Peterborough
- ❖ The Business Board supports applications for the Industrial Strategy Challenge Fund programme

With significant areas of the local economy being considered by the Business Board the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (O&S) has a role in scrutinising the work of the Business Board. In order to do so, an appointed member of Overview & Scrutiny will lead in respect of the work of the Business Board, this member will occupy the position of Lead Member.

#### **Role Title**

Lead Member for Business Board

#### **Role Purpose**

To scrutinise the work of the Business Board, adopting an independent mindset

#### **Role Description**

- Reviewing the Forward Plan, agendas, minutes and reports of the Business Board
- Attending meetings of the Business Board as an observer
- Attending interview panels for Senior Business Board appointments, including Private Sectors Members and Senior Officers
- Attending the Dragons Den (EAP) sessions as an observer
- Reviewing and scrutinising decisions recommended by the Business Board, to the Combined Authority Board  
Liaising with the Chair of the Business Board and officers, to obtain a better understanding of projects
- Reporting findings back to the O&S Committee and Business Board.

#### **Access to Exempt and Confidential Documents**

The Lead Member will not be entitled to copies of:

- (a) of any such document or part of a document as contains exempt or confidential information unless that information is relevant to
  - (i) an action or decision that that member is reviewing or scrutinising; or
  - (ii) any review contained in any programme of work of such a committee or sub-committee of such a committee; or
- (b) of a document or part of a document containing advice provided by a political adviser

The Lead Member will not be permitted to observe meetings of the Business Board where confidential reports and/or documents are being discussed.

## Report title: Co-Option of Independent member from Constituent Councils

To: Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Meeting Date: 28 June 2021

Public report: Yes

From: Rochelle Tapping  
Deputy Monitoring Officer

Recommendations: The Overview & Scrutiny Committee is recommended to

a) Consider the co-option of an independent member (and substitute) from a Constituent Council.

Voting arrangements: A simple majority of all Members

### 1. Purpose

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to ask the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to consider the appointment an independent member (and substitute), from a Constituent Council for the ensuing year.

### 2. Background

- 2.1 The Combined Authority at its Annual General Meeting on 2 June 2021 confirmed the appointment of members nominated by constituent councils to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- 2.2 The Board also requested the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to consider the co-option of an independent member (and substitute) from a Constituent Council for the municipal year 2021/22. The substitute will not necessarily be required to be a named substitute from the same Constituent Council.
- 2.3 In the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny (CFGs) guidance - Overview and scrutiny in combined authorities: a plain English guide (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition) (appended to this report) it is stated that co-opted members can be:



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE  
& PETERBOROUGH**  
COMBINED AUTHORITY

- *local people with a particular expertise, or who are connected with another local organisation or body*
- *Co-optees can bring to bear a different perspective to that of elected members and providing particular subject expertise as well (depending on who is appointed)*

However, CGFS also state that co-option should only be pursued when there is ‘*an obvious skill or capacity gap on the committee that cannot be met any other way*’.

*When appointed, co-optees ought to be treated as full members of the committee with just as much right to participate in debate and discussion as any other member – with the critical difference that they do not hold voting rights.*

- 2.5 An appointment would not compromise the political balance of the Committee. The co-opted member (and substitute) is without voting rights but may be given voting rights by resolution of the combined authority.
- 2.6 If the Committee wished to pursue co-opting an Independent Member (and substitute), this would be actioned by recommendation to the Combined Authority including amendment to the constitution, formally allowing for co-opted members. A process of selection would follow which could include seeking expressions of interests with a random selection made by an independent officer of the authority, witnessed by the Monitoring Officer.

### 3. Financial Implications

- 3.1 In accordance with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Order 2017, no remuneration is to be payable by the Combined Authority to its members including co-opted members of the Overview and Committee.

### 4. Legal Implications

- 4.1 The Combined Authorities (Overview and Scrutiny Committees, Access to Information and Audit Committees) Order 2017 provides for members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee appointed from the constituent councils and those who are appointed other than from the constituent councils. The CFGS guidance referred to within the main body of the report describes three categories of members:

1. *Members of the committee appointed from a constituent authority. These members have a vote and are taken into account for the purpose of political proportionality.*



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE  
& PETERBOROUGH**  
COMBINED AUTHORITY

*Such members would be nominated by their home authority, subject to proportionality requirements...*

2. *Members of the committee appointed from a non-constituent authority. These members do not have a vote. Such members would be nominated by their home authority....*
3. *Members of the committee who are co-opted, because of their skills and experience, or for some other reason. These members do not have a vote and are not taken into account for the purpose of political proportionality. A separate appointment process will be required for these people.*

- 4.1 The appointment of an Independent Member (and Substitute) would fall under 'some other reason' as described above. An amendment to the constitution would formalise this approach and a fair and transparent process would need to be implemented for such appointments.
- 4.2 The Committee also has the option to recommend to the Combined Authority the appointment of a co-opted member to address a skill and/or capacity gap. This approach would more closely align with CFGS guidance.

## 5. Background Papers

- 5.1 [CA Board Agenda 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2021 & Decision Summary](#)

## 6. Appendices

Centre for Governance and Scrutiny Guide to Overview & Scrutiny in Combined Authorities



# Overview and scrutiny in combined authorities: a plain English guide

---

Second edition

Written by Ed Hammond, CfGS

©2021 Centre for Governance and Scrutiny

Permission granted to reproduce for personal and educational use only.

Commercial copying, hiring, lending is prohibited.



## Background and context

### Devolution in general

In England, devolution is the process by which power and control is passed from the Government to local areas. The idea is to give local areas the power to effect real change on issues like transport, economic development, skills and public health.

For most areas, the mechanism through which this will happen is through the establishment of a Mayoral Combined Authority (MCA).

MCAs are at various stages of development across the UK. When the first edition of this guide was published they, and the overview and scrutiny systems designed to form a part of their governance framework, were yet to be tested in practice. This new edition has provided an opportunity for us to reflect on the three and a half years of practice since their introduction.

Combined authorities need strong governance to work well. They provide a forum and a framework for joint decision-making, and as such their systems and processes need to be designed and maintained with care. That design needs to be more flexible than that of local authorities – the bespoke nature of MCAs’ deals with Government, and the developing nature of those deals, means that scrutiny and governance needs to be managed to meet specific regional needs.

Nationally, there is one key point of learning which runs through this guidance – that scrutiny in combined authorities is distinct to that in local authorities. Although legal powers and modes of operation are superficially similar, the demands of MCA operations must lead to a significantly different approach. This guidance aims to describe that approach and provide MCA overview and scrutiny functions with the practical tools to deliver it.

### Further information

Between 2015 and 2017 we published a range of papers setting out the emerging governance position for devolution. Although the policy landscape has since moved on some fundamental principles remain, and these principles are reflected throughout this document. Some of the principal source material is:

- “Devo how, devo why?” (CfGS, 2015);
- “Charting the way” (CfGS, 2016)
- “Combined authorities: a plain English guide” (LGA, 2016)

There are a range of related legislative provisions. Aside from the bespoke orders establishing the governance arrangements for individual MCAs, these include:

- The Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009;
- The Cities and Local Devolution Act 2016;
- The Combined Authorities (Overview and Scrutiny, Access to Information and Audit Committees) Order 2017 (SI 67);
- Overview and scrutiny: statutory guidance for councils and combined authorities (HMG, 2019)

Other powers relating to overview and scrutiny can be found in Schedule 5A of the 2009 Act, as amended by the 2016 Act.

In some instances an MCA OSC may provide scrutiny and support to a Mayor who is a police, fire and crime commissioner. Separate guidance on such matters is available but this guidance does provide

some brief commentary on how this might link in to scrutiny's broader role.

We do not refer in detail to every line of the legislation in this guidance, but the key aspects – relating to the powers of scrutiny, the composition and chairing of committees and the powers of call-in – are covered in depth.

Because many of those carrying out scrutiny activity in MCAs will have a local government background (as councillors and officers), elements of this guide will dwell on the distinctions and differences between scrutiny at local authority and MCA level.

## Why scrutiny?

In a Mayoral Combined Authority, there are three points of power and accountability.

- The directly elected Mayor;
- The Combined Authority (CA), as represented by the local authority Leaders and others who sit on it;
- The CA overview and scrutiny committee (CA OSC), holding both to account.

Ultimately, all three of these sets of people are accountable to local people. The direct election of the Mayor in particular gives them a unique and immediate accountability to all those living in the area.

The relationship between all three of these individuals or groups must be clear and well-understood. Only two have decision-making authority (the exception being overview and scrutiny) but all three will hold each other to account in some way. All have their own source of democratic legitimacy. All should have priorities which are broadly aligned. For decision-makers, this should mean that their activities reflect a collective vision for the future of the area; for scrutiny, this is about ensuring that the focus of the function engages closely with that vision.

This fact is why the function of scrutiny in an MCA differs from that of a local authority. Combined authority working is about long term strategy; while delivery of services is a key component (in particular, in relation to transport) it is not the dominant feature as is the case for local authorities. The scope and nature of overview and scrutiny must, therefore, look very different. MCAs using local scrutiny as a model to transpose onto operations at a sub-regional level will find it difficult to make scrutiny effective.

Alongside this challenge of role and focus, scrutiny also faces challenges of resourcing at MCA level. MCAs are smaller, leaner organisations than local authorities; the nature of officer support for scrutiny is likely to look different.

Effective scrutiny is not just the responsibility of scrutiny members and the officers who support them. It is a collective duty. The Mayor and CA leadership are just as responsible for making it work.

## Dealing with the differences between local authority scrutiny and combined authority scrutiny

Most of those involved in MCA scrutiny – from the officer and member sides – will be familiar with scrutiny at a local authority (LA) level. As we note elsewhere, the legal framework underpinning MCA scrutiny closely reflects LA scrutiny. Government guidance on scrutiny applies to the function at both geographical levels.

As such it would be tempting to assume that the two forms of scrutiny are identical, but this is not the case. There need to be significant differences – reflecting the different ways that MCAs work, and their priorities. There are also some distinctions relating to the structure and management of scrutiny committees at MCA level.

Some of the principal differences are set out below. There are all explored in more detail later in the text.

| Local authority scrutiny   | Combined authority scrutiny  |
|--|--|
| Focus on strategic matters but with operational delivery influencing and informing where scrutiny's priorities lie   | Highly strategic – about long term growth and strategies to deliver change in 20 to 30 years time. In most areas, operational oversight relating to transport      |
| Involves oversight of a very wide range of service, safeguarding and community issues  | Reflects MCA devolution deal – primary focus on economy and growth. Perhaps some oversight on operational matters such as transport                                |
| Strong and close community connection; strong sense of place   | Scale poses challenges for connection to local community   |
| Partnership is important to delivery but scrutiny is often about the council, as an institution, doing things  | Partnership is fundamental to the ability of the MCA to deliver its priorities – everything the MCA does is about partners and partnership                         |
| Scrutiny of the budget reflects the need for close co-ordination with audit; financial monitoring on operational delivery is important; continual review of the budget development process is required; budget scrutiny reflects the fact that councils are large entities with multi-million pound service delivery budgets | Budget and financial focus will need to be on investment, the use of the Growth Fund and other issues rather than about the finances of the MCA as an organisation |
| Quoracy rules set in the constitution, generally requiring the presence of only a few members  | Two thirds of members must be present for meetings to be quorate   |

What this means for scrutiny is that a sequence of sorts is required to ensure that impact can be maximised:

- The need to determine a focused and distinct role, which councillors and officers stick to;
- Using the clarity of this role to build and develop relationships within, and beyond, the MCA;
- Using good relationships to get timely access to proportionate, high quality information about MCA activities which relate to the scrutiny role;
- Using this information to set a realistic work programme which has an impact;
- Determining the ways of working at scrutiny's disposal to deliver this programme.

This guidance deals with all of these issues in depth. It also covers the structural mechanics of establishing and operating committees.

## Scrutiny's distinct role

### The law

The framework for agreeing scrutiny's role is provided in the legislation. Scrutiny has the power to:

- Review or scrutinise actions taken or decisions made by the authority;
- Make reports or recommendations on the above;
- Make reports or recommendations on any issue affecting the authority's area or the area's inhabitants.

This relates to activities either by the CA, or the Mayor.

A CA OSC may require that an officer or member of the authority attend meetings to answer questions. This includes the Mayor or Deputy Mayor. Members of a CA OSC have enhanced rights to access information held by the authority; any information (including exempt or confidential information, excluding advice) must be provided on requests. We cover more on the access to and use of information below.

The law also covers call-in. This will be covered later in more depth, alongside discussions of pre- and post-decision scrutiny.

*Sections 1 & 2, Schedule 5A, Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, as inserted by the Cities and Local Government Devolution Act 2016*

*Article 7(1)-(3) [responding to recommendations], Articles 8 & 10 [use of information], Combined Authorities (Overview and Scrutiny, Access to Information and Audit Committees) Order 2017*

Authorities should take steps to ensure scrutiny has a clear role and focus within the organisation, i.e. a niche within which it can clearly demonstrate it adds value. Therefore, prioritisation is necessary to ensure the scrutiny function concentrates on delivering work that is of genuine value and relevance to the work of the wider authority – this is one of the most challenging parts of scrutiny, and a critical element to get right if it is to be recognised as a strategic function of the authority.

*Overview and scrutiny: statutory guidance for councils and combined authorities*

These broad powers provide the framework within which scrutiny's role can be considered.

A sense of the priorities for devolution in the area, and the opportunities that might exist for scrutiny to contribute to these priorities, will make it easier for members to discuss and agree scrutiny's actual role.

The driving force of the devolution agenda will not be the same everywhere, so scrutiny needs to look different too. Scrutiny will need to be outcome-focused, and its ways of working and ultimate forms and structures must reflect this purpose if it is to have real impact.

This understanding of outcomes is something that should come from an understanding of the deal itself, and the approach that the Mayor and CA, and their partners, plan to take to deliver it. This is why early discussion with the Mayor about scrutiny's role will be important. It will also help to identify the partners – beyond the CA and Mayor – with whom the CA OSC will need to engage if it is to work effectively.

Scrutiny might, for example, provide assistance in the development of policy, by:

- Understanding and overseeing the development and implementation of post-pandemic economic recovery plans – the features of this unique role are discussed in more detail below;
- Reviewing the local community impact of major investment plans;
- Overseeing and evaluating how the CA prioritises decisions on major investments;
- If the CA takes a sector-based approach to its economic development plans, it might look at the ways in which individuals and organisations within those sectors are engaged and involved in the decision-making process;
- Highlighting issues or areas identified by the CA as high-risk, and studying them further.

It would be very difficult, within the resourcing available, to do more than one of these tasks, or to take a more “generalist” approach to scrutiny than we have set out here. This may present a challenge where along with high-level, strategic oversight, members feel a need to keep an active, watching brief on the MCA's operational transport duties – an issue that we explore in more detail below.

Scrutiny is not able to take a broad-brush approach to all MCA business. It is not able to shadow all aspects of the MCA decision-making process or conduct detailed task and finish style inquiries into a wide range of MCA responsibilities cutting across – for example – economic development, skills and transport. Quite apart from anything else, the resources will not exist to carry out such work.

In order to have an impact, scrutiny will have to carefully consider the skills, capabilities and experience of its own members, and how these might map onto the MCA priorities. This is not about picking individual priorities, or parts of priorities, for scrutiny to look at, to the exclusion of other work. Instead, it is likely to be about looking at how those priorities intersect, the work that has gone into developing them and thinking about delivering against them, and thinking about the different contributions that scrutiny might make to that whole process. These are the kinds of areas of focus we highlight in the bullet list above.

There is a real risk that a model of scrutiny which does not articulate, and stick to, a defined role ends up with a committee becoming a clearing-house for officer updates and presentations which, while interesting, will have little impact on the work of the MCA and none whatsoever on the lives of local people.

Getting this right is one of the most important parts of identifying the right role. This is discussed in more detail in the section on prioritisation, below.

## **Effective scrutiny of transport**

In some areas, MCAs have direct operational responsibility for transport. Here, councillors will need to tread a fine line between ensuring that vital transport matters benefit from proportionate oversight, while ensuring that scrutiny is not overwhelmed by a range of operational matters.

In some MCAs, separate Transport Committees or sub-committees exist to carry out this scrutiny work – sometimes a legacy of the pre-MCA days when a distinct Integrated Transport Authority and Passenger Transport Executive led on strategy and delivery for local transport. The CfGS publication “Transport governance in combined authorities” (2020) sets out more detail on these dynamics, and suggests ways that scrutiny of strategic and operational matters can be effectively balanced.

The way that scrutiny of transport is designed and delivered will have to reflect scrutiny’s broader strategic focus, because transport will have an impact on broader MCA priorities and vice versa.

## **Other scrutiny functions: accountability in policing and fire**

Some Mayors also hold responsibility as police and crime commissioners, or policing, fire and crime commissioners.

These roles involve additional statutory duties and, with them, additional responsibilities for scrutiny.

In such MCAs there may be a separate Police, (Fire) and Crime Panel or the functions of such a Panel may form part of those of the MCA OSC itself.

Here, the role of the body will need to take account of additional statutory scrutiny functions. Proper, robust oversight on strategic policing and fire matters is important, and for maximum effect should be properly integrated into scrutiny’s role and work programme. Designing separate meetings or parts of the agenda to focus on police or fire matters is likely to be less effective. A fully-integrated work programme which is able to identify links between police, fire and wider Mayoral responsibilities – capitalising on scrutiny’s ability to identify cross-cutting matters – is likely to be more effective.

More detail can be found at:

■ [CfGS PCP guidance](#)

■ [LGA fire scrutiny guidance](#)

## **How will we know we’re succeeding?**

Having some clear method of assessing whether CA scrutiny is working, or not, will be important.

This will need to refer back to scrutiny’s role. Members might, at the outset, like to reflect on what success would feel and look like – what a successful and effective scrutiny function would achieve. You could then review this after six months or a year to see if these aspirations had been realised and if not, why not.

Overview and scrutiny at local level has struggled to develop effective “performance indicators” to measure success. If you do go down this route, you might think about softer measures – establishing whether scrutiny is seen as an important part of the governance framework, and the extent to which it is respected by the Mayor and CA executive – than more process-driven ones, like those which measure the number of recommendations accepted and implemented. Such recommendations cannot properly engage with the substance and impact of scrutiny’s work.

You should not expect to see success straight away. It is likely that there will be difficulties – particularly in managing the relationships between the key people involved at CA level, and especially during the first few months. But having a sense of what scrutiny’s aims are, in terms of its impact and outcomes, will be important in providing something against which to evaluate the function.

## Engaging with the right people

Authorities should ensure early and regular discussion takes place between scrutiny and the executive, especially regarding the latter’s future work programme. Authorities should, though, be mindful of their distinct roles.

[...]

Effective scrutiny involves looking at issues that can be politically contentious. It is therefore inevitable that, at times, an executive will disagree with the findings or recommendations of a scrutiny committee.

It is the job of both the executive and scrutiny to work together to reduce the risk of this happening, and authorities should take steps to predict, identify and act on disagreement.

One way in which this can be done is via an ‘executive-scrutiny protocol’ which can help define the relationship between the two and mitigate any differences of opinion before they manifest themselves in unhelpful and unproductive ways. The benefit of this approach is that it provides a framework for disagreement and debate, and a way to manage it when it happens. Often, the value of such a protocol lies in the dialogue that underpins its preparation. It is important that these protocols are reviewed on a regular basis.

[...]

The scrutiny function can often lack support and recognition within an authority because there is a lack of awareness among both members and officers about the specific role it plays, which individuals are involved and its relevance to the authority’s wider work. Authorities should, therefore, take steps to ensure all members and officers are made aware of the role the scrutiny committee plays in the organisation, its value and the outcomes it can deliver, the powers it has, its membership and, if appropriate, the identity of those providing officer support

*Overview and scrutiny: statutory guidance for councils and combined authorities*

Scrutiny at MCA level is all about relationships. If scrutiny’s role is clear, building relationships will be easier. Scrutiny will be able to articulate what it does in a way that others understand, and that clearly align with those partners’ own work.

At combined authority level there is the additional complexity of a range of local overview and scrutiny committees, all with their own stake in the process. Although the duties of the Mayor and CA focus on strategic matters, they will have a direct impact on local areas and the responsibilities of the individual constituent authorities – scrutiny will need to recognise those links and act on them.

Relationships will need to be built with:

- The Mayor. Discussing scrutiny's role with the Mayor will be important. The Mayor and CA OSC will need to understand each other and the jobs they have to perform respectively and together. It is likely that the MCA OSC will want to engage in "set piece" scrutiny of the Mayor, relating to its core role and responsibilities – this is described in more detail below;
- The CA Board (and through the Board the individual constituent authorities). Understanding the personal and political dynamics between those on the Board will help scrutiny to direct its attention to the areas where it will have most impact. The Board itself will be carrying out a scrutiny function of sorts, overseeing and supporting the work of the Mayor – it is therefore important that mutual roles and responsibilities are well-articulated, and understood;
- The CA's member Audit function. The roles of scrutiny and audit are distinct, but the CA OSC is likely to want to keep a watching brief over finance issues as part of its work, and the OSC's wider work on policy development and review of the CA's substantive activities will provide useful context for Audit.
- The scrutiny functions of the individual constituent authorities. This is discussed in more detail below;
- Local partners – which might include LEPs if they are not part of the MCA, local transport user groups, local businesses and others. Part of the challenge will lie in identifying this list of partners, which will hinge on what scrutiny's ultimate role is;
- The public. Scrutiny's role will help to define what outward-facing work happens with the public. Engagement may be easier on operational matters like transport. This is discussed in more detail below.

Many of these partners will be in a position to assist scrutiny – by sharing information and insights about the local areas. Speaking to some of these partners will help scrutiny to clarify and refine its role, and to make sure that it is selecting items for further study which reflect both that role and local need.

As the statutory guidance suggests, the development of an executive-scrutiny protocol might provide a way of providing certainty and consistency to some of these key relationships. An executive-scrutiny protocol might set out mutual expectations on the sharing of information, attendance at meetings and responses to reports – as well as expectations around informal dialogue and communication around communication, and steps that can be taken to demonstrate scrutiny's independence from the Mayor and CA Board.

We would not necessarily suggest the agreement of similar protocols with, for example, external partners. The Mayor/CA/scrutiny relationship is key, thus demanding such an approach – scrutiny's relationships with other partners can probably be managed in a more informal way, determined as needs arise. There may be circumstances where a protocol *is* thought necessary – for example, in the case of a separate LEP or LEPs covering the area for which the CA OSC provides external scrutiny.

## **Working with scrutiny in the constituent authorities**

Scrutiny continues in councils across the MCA area. Some of this scrutiny may well intersect with work done at the MCA – particularly where it relates to devolved matters (commonly, economic



development, skills, transport and so on).

If further deals are done, and the responsibilities of the MCA increase, the opportunity for such crossover increases.

An important element of the devolution process is the concept of subsidiarity – the idea that responsibility for an issue should be held at the lowest appropriate level. In devolution, that will be important to prevent power from being drawn up to the regional level. This is equally important for the operation of scrutiny.

As such, there will be a wide range of operational issues relating to matters within the MCA's responsibility that the MCA OSC might want to look at. Tempting though this may be, it could make more sense to leave consideration of such local matters to local OSCs. It may be that on some projects the MCA OSC and the OSCs of individual councils can work together, formally or informally.

There will be no way to easily decide what happens best at what level. Frequent dialogue between the CA OSC and OSCs in constituent authorities will probably be the best way to proceed. Given that most CA OSC members will be members of constituent authorities, this dialogue can be expected to happen as a matter of course, but officers should still keep up informal communication on a regular basis – in particular the sharing of work programmes.

This informal dialogue will prevent risks of overlap and duplication, and highlight opportunities for joint working.

We would not necessarily recommend the development of protocols or memoranda of understanding, or the convening of regular workshops or joint meetings, to share information and approaches. Regular informal dialogue should be enough.

## **Working with the public**

The public can be key partners in MCA scrutiny. This is particularly the case where scrutiny's role is especially outward facing, seeking to understand the impact of key strategic decisions on local communities. An MCA OSC may however find it difficult to engage with the public across a wide geographic area in a way that is proportionate, and that sits within a tight resource envelope. Public engagement will need to be targeted to scrutiny's role and to the specific inquiries or issues that scrutiny is investigating, and MCAs should expect to provide support from other MCA staff to enable scrutiny to meet these objectives. This should form part of an executive-scrutiny protocol. We discuss the practicalities of public engagement in the section below on "ways of working".

This cuts to wider issues around the public "visibility" of overview and scrutiny at combined authority level. Scrutiny is carried out on behalf of the public and therefore requires transparency. MCAs should expect that some scrutiny work – set-piece questioning of the Mayor, for example – will be high profile. Scrutiny should be looking at matters of high importance, which may be politically contentious. This may particularly be the case where scrutiny engages with more operational matters, like transport. Communications support may need to be provided to ensure that scrutiny engages with these issues effectively. Again, this should form part of an executive-scrutiny protocol.

### Case study: public questions in committee

Committees, in a formal sense, are “meetings in public”, rather than public meetings. There is not an automatic right for members of the public in attendance to ask questions or to contribute – although using different ways of working (for example, an “inquiry day”-style format which may explicitly seek to draw in public evidence) may provide for this more effectively.

In general, members of the public can find that the opportunity to ask public questions ends up being a frustrating experience.

If provision exists in standing orders or committee rules of procedure to do so, the member of the public may only have two or three minutes to ask a question. They may or may not receive an answer at the meeting itself; this will depend on whether someone is present to provide an answer. Questions often formally need to be “put” to the Chair; but the chair, as a scrutineer, may not be in a position to answer.

Usually there will be an expectation that, in order for an answer to be prepared, a question is put on public deposit beforehand, which also hinders accessibility. The member of the public may or may not have the opportunity to ask a supplementary question.

All in all, there are more effective and satisfactory ways to provide for direct public questions than through scrutiny. These might include:

- Provision for a member of the public with a matter of concern to use scrutiny as a mechanism for bringing that matter to the attention of the Mayor or CA more generally. Scrutiny could “champion” such issues; the Chair could ensure that substantive answers are received and, better yet, that the issue is resolved to the satisfaction of the person involved;
- Public involvement through inquiry days or other mechanisms better designed to ensure that local voices are heard.

## Getting, and using, information to support prioritising work

### The law

Members of the CA OSC have enhanced rights to access information under the control of the CA or the Mayor. Relevant information is that which relates to any business transacted at a decision-making meeting of the CA, or any matter in relation to which a decision has been made.

Information must be relevant to a matter under scrutiny by the member in question.

Where such a request is refused, a reason must be given.

*Article 10, Combined Authorities (Overview and Scrutiny, Access to Information and Audit Committees) Order 2017*

When considering what information scrutiny needs in order to carry out its work, scrutiny members and the executive should consider scrutiny's role and the legal rights that committees and their individual members have, as well as their need to receive timely and accurate information to carry out their duties effectively.

Scrutiny members should have access to a regularly available source of key information about the management of the authority – particularly on performance, management and risk. Where this information exists, and scrutiny members are given support to understand it, the potential for what officers might consider unfocused and unproductive requests is reduced as members will be able to frame their requests from a more informed position.

*Overview and scrutiny: statutory guidance for councils and combined authorities*

Scrutiny needs information to work properly. Information needs to be timely and targeted to scrutiny's role.

Scrutiny is not a place for officers to share general updates on their activities, or for councillors to keep a watching brief on the activities of the Mayor. Such an approach risks that scrutiny will take a scattergun approach – alighting upon issues in an unco-ordinated way, and in a manner which is likely to both duplicate discussions elsewhere, and also focus unduly on operational matters (where they fall within an MCA's purview).

The consideration of detailed performance and finance data (and other data-heavy reports and presentations) at a formal committee is also a practice that tends to be ineffective. It is often best that such “regularly available sources of information”, as described in the statutory guidance, is shared with members between meetings, with member briefings convened if there is felt to be a specific, justified need for face-to-face conversations. Having access to this information means that members can then make more informed choices about what issues they actually escalate to committee for discussion. This reflects the need for councillors to drive the work process, rather than having reports and information brought to them merely for information and comment.

This ensures that information can be properly used to inform the work programming process.

## **Prioritising work: effective work programming**

### **The law**

The law does not provide for work programmes, but it does state that any member of the OSC, of the combined authority or of any constituent council may refer an issue to the CA OSC. Referral means placing the item on the scrutiny agenda for discussion.

A member making a referral may make representations to help the committee to decide whether to use its powers to scrutinise that issue. If the committee chooses not to, it should give reasons.

*The natural interpretation of this article of the Order is that, where the CA OSC has a work programme which is placed on the agenda for consideration and update at every meeting, it will be sufficient for a referral to be tabled as part of that item, with the committee deciding if it should be placed on the work programme for more detailed substantive discussion at a later date. CAs may want to put in place arrangements to allow for urgency – for example where urgency requires an immediate scrutiny response.*

*Article 6, Combined Authorities (Overview and Scrutiny, Access to Information and Audit Committees) Order 2017*

Approaches to shortlisting topics should reflect scrutiny's overall role in the authority. This will require the development of bespoke, local solutions, however when considering whether an item should be included in the work programme, the kind of questions a scrutiny committee should consider might include:

- Do we understand the benefits scrutiny would bring to this issue?
- How could we best carry out work on this subject?
- What would be the best outcome of this work?
- How would this work engage with the activity of the executive and other decision-makers, including partners?

*Overview and scrutiny: statutory guidance for councils and combined authorities*

Where the MCA OSC takes a rigorous approach to prioritising its work, and only placing items on the work programme where they will clearly add value, and where they relate to scrutiny's role, the work programme will reflect that exercise. It will demonstrate scrutiny's focus on what's important. Work programming should be a challenging exercise, as members seek evidence to justify plans to consider certain items. Items should not be placed on scrutiny's agenda unless they relate clearly to scrutiny's overall role, and there is a clear sense of what value scrutiny will add through its work.

### **The "information digest"**

Scrutiny should use information from a range of sources to back its decisions on these matters; this means that meetings themselves can focus on forensic questioning activity rather than exploratory discussions in which members are simply trying to learn more about a subject. The statutory guidance on scrutiny suggests the use of an "information digest", drawing together information from a regularly-updated range of sources, which together can give members a good sense of how the MCA is delivering its priorities. This can also help members to manage scrutiny of more complex, and more operational matters, such as transport. Here, prioritisation is particularly important, otherwise there is the risk that scrutiny gets drawn down to the most parochial issues – the placement of individual bus stops, for example – where this is little value to be had.

Work programming helps officers supporting the OSC to understand where their input might be required. It helps them, and members, to plan for scrutiny's work, and makes it more likely that work will have an impact. The work programme should be supported by other MCA officers too; the MCA officer corps, the Mayor and Board all have an interest in ensuring that members have the information to hand to select matters for inquiry where real value can be added.

Urgent issues are always likely to arise over the course of the year. At the time of writing, the ongoing pandemic places significant and short-term demands on prioritisation, making this activity particularly difficult. Work programmes are living documents and a confident and effective MCA OSC will be able to make informed judgments about whether something is of sufficient importance to go onto the programme at short notice. That said, it is likely that an OSC will want to have a broad long-term framework for the committee in mind to ensure that it is demonstrably transacting its role.

More on the principles underpinning work programming can be found in "Planning work, delivering impact" (CfGS, 2020).

### Worked example: linking work programming development to scrutiny's role

It may be that an MCA OSC concludes that its role should be to oversee the approach the CA and its partners take to incorporating the views and concerns of the public into its plans and policies. This OSC might decide that it would develop its work programme to fulfil this role in the following way:

- Arrange regular informal meetings between the Chair and senior CA officers to talk about the ways they are “designing in” input from the public when they are developing major decisions, and then sharing the outcomes of these meetings with the public;
- Use discussions with local overview and scrutiny committees to understand where public concerns lie on issues connected to the CA's strategic responsibilities, and decide whether these should be tackled at local level or at CA level;
- Use performance, finance and risk reports produced by the CA or its audit committee (which are communicated to members on a regular basis, between meetings, as they are produced) to highlight and escalate issues where public engagement and buy-in are seen as particular problems – this is the core of the “information digest” described above;
- Use insight from the local press, complaints from the public and local community and advocacy groups to understand what issues to focus on;
- Using a range of techniques more useful than traditional “consultations” to have a conversation with the public about local services planned by the CA, or with CA involvement;
- Use all of the above to inform two things in how the Mayor and CA are held to account:
  - Firstly, planning public meetings of the CA OSC to maximise the potential for public input;
  - Secondly, using public insight to inform questions asked of the Mayor and CA in public.

This is just one example of one way of looking at a given issue. It highlights how the approach taken to scrutiny will be highly bespoke – it will hinge on scrutiny's overall role and the ways of working with which members, and the MCA itself, are most comfortable.

## Ways of working

Scrutiny has limited resources. While scrutiny committees have great scope and freedom in how they choose to transact their work these resource constraints will often be a direct consideration.

A single committee model with a tight focus – likely to be the most effective model for MCA scrutiny as we have suggested – is one that suggests a range of ways of practically carrying out scrutiny work, as follows:

- Receiving updates and other general reports between meetings in the form of an “information digest” as described above;
- Using that digest / range of key sources of information to select a limited number of items for further, public scrutiny;
- Convening committee meetings which have only one or two substantive items on an agenda – which may involve:
  - “Set-piece” questioning of the Mayor or another senior MCA politician;

- Taking evidence from a panel of experts on the subject in question;
  - Roundtable-style discussion focused on identifying practical solutions to a defined problem.
- Convening longer committee meetings which take an “inquiry day” -style format – with the intention of producing defined recommendations at the end based on verbal evidence from a variety of individuals working through a carefully structured inquiry-style agenda;
  - Short, sharp task and finish-style working – perhaps only involving a handful of members engaging in some limited review of an issue away from a committee, reporting back quickly. In some cases it may be appropriate for a single member to be commissioned as a “rapporteur” to carry out such investigations.

In those MCAs with operational transport responsibilities, separate transport committees (or separate structures) may exist to provide oversight – as we set out in “Transport governance in combined authorities” (2020). Transport scrutiny may look different to scrutiny of other strategic issues because of this – officers and members will need to take care to ensure that the principles discussed in this paper are used to inform all activities even if scrutiny of transport needs to look and feel slightly different. MCAs may consider that drawing oversight of all matters – including transport – together in one committee may produce problems because of this distinctive character.

We have already noted that some ways of working are generally ineffective. Long officer presentations, and committee agendas that cram in large numbers of substantive items, are two examples – everyone will want to avoid the prospect of scrutiny becoming a paper-reviewing machine.

Longer-term and more resource-intensive task and finish-style reviews – of a type local councillors may be more familiar – are also likely to be less appropriate and effective in an MCA context. This is primarily for resource reasons, because such work can often end up looking and feeling quite open-ended, because the policy context can often be too fast-moving (long term task and finish working being not especially agile) and on account of councillors’ likely availability. For major and wide-ranging topics however exceptions might be made, and we suggest one example of this below in the form of scrutiny of post-pandemic economic recovery plans.

### **Case study: set-piece Mayoral scrutiny**

An MCA OSC can expect to carry out frequent set-piece scrutiny of the Mayor. We suggest that time be set aside for this activity at least twice a year.

This will involve the Mayor attending a committee meeting to answer members’ questions on a variety of topics. This will provide an opportunity for members to further explore issues of critical importance relating to their role.

For this form of scrutiny preparation is critically important. The experience of MCAs has generally been that making it “count” is a challenge – the breadth of issues on which the Mayor is questioned often means that full answers cannot be given, and many questions end up being exploratory, rather than forensic, in nature.

Below we set out a process for this form of scrutiny derived from the experiences of MCAs. It is likely that a similar approach could be adopted to set piece scrutiny of other high profile individuals.

#### **Preparation**

- Meeting dates would be set a year in advance;
- Brief planning meeting between the Chair and scrutiny officer to look at the work programme and

to determine on what matters evidence from the Mayor might be useful. This will include a review of current, high profile issues to assess the need for the Mayor to answer questions on them;

- Chair and scrutiny officer to circulate a brief plan for the session to other members which sets out themes and focus for the meeting;
- On the wider committee's assent, basic information about the areas of the committee's focus are shared with the Mayor. The Chair and committee might have exploratory questions to help them to focus and refine their approach, and these should be answered before the committee meeting itself;
- Papers for the meeting are issued which contains any statement or other information which the Mayor wishes to share;
- The committee convene for a pre-meeting immediately before the committee meeting to consider what information they have to hand, to agree on the detail of the questioning process and to divide up themes and questions between them.

### **The meeting itself**

- The Mayor is not invited to give a presentation at the start – the session heads straight into questions;
- The Chair is able to manage questioning as there is an agreed approach allowing the committee to operate as a team – questioning proceeds in a planned and systematic way through agreed topics;
- The fact that the Mayor knows which topics are being looked at (if not the detail of the questions) means that he/she will be able to answer questions then and there.

### **After the meeting**

- The Chair and committee hold a short wash-up session, by phone or online, following the meeting;
- The wash-up session identifies any changes that need to be made the work programme as a result of the session;
- Actions and requests for further information are followed up promptly.

## **Pre- and post-decision scrutiny – “shadowing” the decision-making process**

### **The law**

The CA OSC will have the power to call in decisions of the Mayor and Combined Authority which have been made but not implemented. This applies to all decisions, not just “key decisions”.

Section 1(2)(a), Schedule 5A, Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, as inserted by the Cities and Local Government Devolution Act 2016

A stop can be placed on the implementation of the decision once it is under scrutiny.

*Section 4(1), Schedule 5A, Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, as inserted by the Cities and Local Government Devolution Act 2016*



The legislation does not specify the circumstances in which call-in can be triggered.

Key decisions must be publicised. This includes publicity 28 days prior to when they are expected to be made, although urgency provisions do exist which allow the timescale to be shortened – usually, with the agreement of the chair of the CA OSC. This will help the CA OSC to understand when particularly important decisions may be coming to be made, and to plan to influence them beforehand.

There is a period of (usually) five clear days after the decision is made for it to be called in. A certain number of members of the committee, or the CA, will be required to sign their names to a call-in for it to be valid.

Once the decision has been called in, a meeting will need to be convened in order to consider the issue and make recommendations.

If a call-in request is valid, the CA OSC may direct that the decision not be implemented for a period of up to fourteen days, to allow a scrutiny meeting to be convened. The power to direct sits with the CA OSC, but they can choose to delegate this function to the Chair as part of the local call-in rules, to avoid the need to convene a second meeting to deal with this issue at short notice.

Given the fourteen-day timescale, the CA OSC would need to quickly notify CA officers of the information required to support the meeting and the officers needed to attend; the Chair, and officers, would need to plan the meeting with those members who had made the call-in to ensure that time at the meeting could be used to best effect.

The CA OSC has two options, on considering a call-in. The first is not to make any recommendations. Under these circumstances, on expiry of the fourteen day (or shorter) the decision can be implemented. The second is to make recommendations. If this happens, whatever the recommendations might be, the CA or Mayor must hold a meeting to reconsider the decision.

Notwithstanding the CA OSC's recommendations, the Mayor or CA can still at this point decide to go ahead with implementing the decision, but it will have to give reasons if this goes against the scrutiny recommendation.

Call-in provisions must be published; the CA itself must sign them off before they take effect.

*Section 1(4), (5) and (6), Schedule 5A, Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009*

*Articles 7(4), 11-13, Combined Authorities (Overview and Scrutiny, Access to Information and Audit Committees) Order 2017*

The practice of shadowing Mayoral and CA decision-making deserves further comment. This appears to be a focused and directed way for effective scrutiny to happen – directly targeted at decision-making itself. It aligns closely with specific powers of call-in given to the MCA OSC (and on which we comment below). It is an approach which can therefore seem attractive. This could take the form of what some councils call “pre-decision” scrutiny – the practice of reviewing decisions which are due to be made by decision-makers in a few weeks. It could also take the form of immediate post-decision scrutiny, or “call-in”.

We would recommend a degree of healthy scepticism about the value of such scrutiny – although as we note below, if information about forthcoming decisions is not shared in a timely manner with scrutiny members it is an approach which an OSC can be forced into adopting.

With this caveat, this form of scrutiny is sometimes of poor value, delivering little real impact – although there can be exceptions. Scrutinising the full spread of executive decisions shortly before



or after they come to be made minimises the opportunity for those decisions to be meaningfully influenced, and members are unlikely to have the information at their disposal to make informed and high-quality recommendations on those points anyway. It is also likely to work against the idea of scrutiny having a sharp, focused role.

Call-in is a particularly blunt instrument. It can be useful in extremis – when all other methods to influence a decision have failed and members of the CA OSC have such concerns that they consider the decision needs to be delayed. This can bring an issue out into the open and force reconsideration. But reconsideration is all that needs to happen; the relevant decision-maker does not need to change their mind.

Pre-decision and post-decision scrutiny can be more effective under two sets of circumstances:

- Where a Forward Plan is used to identify a small number of key decisions for scrutiny to look at, focusing members' efforts and allowing more work to be carried out to prepare for the exercise – particularly when those key decisions are one that relate closely to scrutiny's agreed role. The meaning of the phrase "key decision" is covered below;
- When the scrutiny happens a decent time before the decision comes to be made – not a matter of a couple of weeks. Effective CA forward planning should allow for scrutiny to be forewarned months in advance of particularly critical decisions; such forward planning also helps with fitting this form of scrutiny into the committee cycle. Again, the way that such matters are identified will need to relate closely to scrutiny's role.

## **Identifying key decisions: the Forward Plan and thresholds**

MCAs have very different approaches to the key decision thresholds for the purpose of the Forward Plan (otherwise known as the "schedule of key decision").

This threshold is important, because it determines where a decision will be subject to additional requirements on transparency, and subject to call-in.

An MCA OSC should be able to consider the current key decision (KD) threshold, and whether it meets the expectation of members as providing for effective, proportionate scrutiny. A key decision threshold set too high risks harming public, and members' confidence in the transparency and effectiveness of the decision-making regime. It is likely that the threshold will be different for different MCAs – reflecting the different nature of deals, and differences in local political culture and expectations.

One solution is for the scrutiny officer and Chair to have early conversations with key directors about the developing programme of MCA work, of which key decisions are likely to form part. This sharing of information earlier in the process will make it easier for scrutiny to focus its time and resources. There are likely to be areas where the MCA OSC will want to exert influence which may include matters subject to future key decisions; scrutiny will want to have input into those matters well before the policy relating to these matters is formally decided.

This will provide justification for the OSC to exert particularly anxious scrutiny when matters come on to the Forward Plan of which they might not have been aware, or whose contents appear different to those shared earlier in the process. Directors, the CA Board and the Mayor will need to be aware that a loose approach to KD thresholds, and a loose approach to the timing at which KDs and prospective KDs are shared with scrutiny, makes urgent, "shadowing"-style pre-decision and post-decision (call-in) scrutiny more likely, and more necessary.

### The law

A statutory scrutiny officer – an officer of the CA, not one of the constituent councils – must be appointed.

The scrutiny officer may be someone seconded to the CA from another council.

*Article 9, Combined Authorities (Overview and Scrutiny, Access to Information and Audit Committees) Order 2017*

The resource an authority allocates to the scrutiny function plays a pivotal role in determining how successful that function is and therefore the value it can add to the work of the authority.

Ultimately it is up to each authority to decide on the resource it provides, but every authority should recognise that creating and sustaining an effective scrutiny function requires them to allocate resources to it.

Authorities should also recognise that support for scrutiny committees, task groups and other activities is not solely about budgets and provision of officer time, although these are clearly extremely important elements. Effective support is also about the ways in which the wider authority engages with those who carry out the scrutiny function (both members and officers).

*Overview and scrutiny: statutory guidance for councils and combined authorities*

Most MCAs now employ a dedicated scrutiny officer to provide policy and administrative support to their OSC. This individual will often sit as part of a small, lean officer corps for the MCA generally. Resource commitments for scrutiny which will be felt keenly in a local authority will be even more acute in an MCA.

In developing their work programme and considering their role, MCA OSC members will need to recognise these constraints. They demand a focused and self-critical approach which accepts that there will be a number of interesting matters that the OSC will not be able to look at. The idea of identifying a clear focus or role is, in part, a way of dealing effectively with this limited resource, and ensuring that what resource is available is directed to scrutiny of the right issues, at the right time, in the right way.

It is therefore important for MCA statutory officers to recognise that there is a collective responsibility for making scrutiny work. Governance officers will require support from subject specialists. A scrutiny function which is more focused – which has a defined role, and which sticks to carrying out work of demonstrable value – will justify support from others in the organisation. It should be recognised in doing so that scrutiny must remain independently led by non-executive members.

Members may also wish to think about the support that might be provided by the scrutiny functions of constituent (and non-constituent) authorities. This may depend on the substantive links built between the CA OSC and those scrutiny functions, which we cover in more detail above.

## Committee structure and composition

The structure of an MCA's scrutiny arrangements will depend on its role and ways of working, which is why this section is towards the end of the guidance. Structure should be the final rather than the first consideration when scrutiny is being evaluated.

Most detail on structure and composition of an MCA OSC can be found in the Act and the bespoke Order for each MCA. The Act and Order provide a framework for further discussion on these matters.

### What should the committee structure look like?

#### The law

A CA must have at least one overview and scrutiny committee, but it may have more, which may establish sub-committees.

Section 1(1), Section 2(1), Schedule 5A, Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009

Many councils have more than one overview and scrutiny committee, to allow members the opportunity to do a significant amount of their work in public.

Most MCAs have a single overview and scrutiny. This reflects the resource envelope and the difficulty, in many instances, in convening quorate meetings (see below). Covering large geographical areas, the logistical challenges in convening multiple frequent meetings will be significant. With the combined authority having a strategic function, moreover, a lighter approach can be taken.

We anticipate that most combined authorities will continue to maintain a single overview and scrutiny committee to carry out broad strategic oversight – possibly supplemented by a separate transport committee where relevant.

### Who chairs?

#### The law

The Chair can be an “independent” person, or if not, they can be an “appropriate” person.

An “independent” person is not a sitting councillor of one of the constituent councils, or a close friend or family member of such a person. Such a person may, however, be a member of a registered political party. If you want to have an independent person as chair, you will need to carry out a public recruitment process. We provide advice on this process below.

Alternatively, if the chair is not independent they must be “appropriate”. This means that they must be a sitting councillor for a constituent authority. They must also be of a different party to the majority of councillors in the area. In many areas this is likely to mean that the chair will be of a different political party to the CA Mayor and most of the area's leaders.

*Section 3, Schedule 5A, Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009*

*Articles 5(2) – 5(4), 5(6), Combined Authorities (Overview and Scrutiny, Access to Information and Audit Committees) Order 2017*

## Who sits on the committee(s)?

### The law

The combined authority itself is responsible for appointing members onto the CA OSC. For the purposes of the Order, members fall into three categories:

- Members of the committee appointed from a constituent authority. These members have a vote and are taken into account for the purpose of political proportionality. Such members would be nominated by their home authority, subject to proportionality requirements. There is no requirement that each council has to nominate one member;
- Members of the committee appointed from a non-constituent authority. These members do not have a vote. Such members would be nominated by their home authority;
- Members of the committee who are co-opted, because of their skills and experience, or for some other reason. These members do not have a vote, and are not taken into account for the purpose of political proportionality. A separate appointment process will be required for these people.

The committee must – when taken as a whole – reflect the political proportionality in effect across the CA authority area. This means that even though non-constituent members do not have a vote, they are taken into account for this purpose.

Following appointment of any member, the combined authority must (within 28 days) formally publicise the appointment, including the period for which the member has been appointed. Following local authority practice the period of appointment is likely to be one year, although it may be different for co-optees (see below).

*Articles 3 and 4(1), Combined Authorities (Overview and Scrutiny, Access to Information and Audit Committees) Order 2017*

When selecting individual members to serve on scrutiny committees, an authority should consider a member's experience, expertise, interests, ability to act impartially, ability to work as part of a group, and capacity to serve.

Authorities should not take into account a member's perceived level of support for or opposition to a particular political party (notwithstanding the wider legal requirement for proportionality).

The Chair plays a leadership role on a scrutiny committee as they are largely responsible for establishing its profile, influence and ways of working.

The attributes authorities should and should not take into account when selecting individual committee members (see paragraphs 27 and 28) also apply to the selection of the Chair, but the Chair should also possess the ability to lead and build a sense of teamwork and consensus among committee members.

*Overview and scrutiny: statutory guidance for councils and combined authorities*

There is a requirement for overall political balance within the committee, reflective of the wider geographical area. MCAs will already have in place mechanisms to determine appropriate balance and for the nomination of councillors by individual constituent authorities.

## **Co-option**

Co-opted members can be local people with a particular expertise, or who are connected with another local organisation or body. They provide a way of deepening the effectiveness of scrutiny in carrying out its chosen role.

Co-optees can bring to bear a different perspective to that of elected members and providing particular subject expertise as well (depending on who is appointed).

Engaging and retaining co-optees can, however, be a challenge – particularly at a sub-regional level. MCA OSCs may conclude that co-option should only be pursued when there is an obvious skill or capacity gap on the committee that cannot be met any other way – for example, by engaging someone to act as an independent technical advisor or simply taking evidence from a local expert.

When appointed, co-optees ought to be treated as full members of the committee with just as much right to participate in debate and discussion as any other member – with the critical difference that they do not hold voting rights.

When a local authority wishes to appoint co-optees to scrutiny committees, it needs to do so in accordance with a co-option “scheme” which the authority has agreed. There is no such requirement for a co-option scheme at the combined authority, but it may still be useful to set out some basic principles for the identification and appointment of co-opted members. These might include:

- A public, well-advertised recruitment process with clear selection criteria;
- A requirement for those putting themselves forward as candidates to place on public record their expectations for the role and the contribution they would make on the committee;
- A member-led selection process culminating in an interview (which might take place in public);
- A limited term of office (say, two years), which could be extended by mutual agreement of the co-optee and the committee.

Co-opted members will be performing an important public role on the committee; they do not have the benefit of having been directly elected by local people and hence care is required to ensure that the way that they are selected is as open and accountable as possible. It goes without saying that co-optees would need to adhere to the same standards and codes of conduct as elected members.

## **Quoracy: when and where should committees meet?**

Quoracy has been a dominant challenge for MCA OSCs since their establishment. The challenge of drawing together members from a wide geographical area for regular meetings has proven difficult with the added requirement that two thirds of members must be present for meetings to be quorate. The advent during the pandemic of remote meetings has made matters more straightforward – however, even if powers to convene meetings remotely are extended, quoracy is a consideration which will need to be addressed in the design of the committee work programme.

- Making agendas relevant and compelling is, of course, one way to encourage attendance. With other calls on their time members need to prioritise their commitments and will rightly focus on matters where they can make a difference. Scrutiny work which is vital and immediate will help to engage a wider range of councillors.

- Schedule meetings at times, and places, which maximise the likelihood of attendance. Meetings do not need to be held in CA or local authority buildings (Schedule 12, s4(1) LGA 1972). Holding meetings near transport hubs or other places where access for members is straightforward will help; an MCA OSC should not feel under an obligation to move from Town Hall to Town Hall for its meetings;
- Carrying out work through a range of informal and formal ways of working. We noted above how short and sharp task and finish-style working can supplement and complement business in committee. It might be decided to carry out less work in committee – cutting the frequency of meetings – and more in this way, which does not have the same quoracy requirements and which can be more flexible. However, there are transparency implications to this approach;
- Active management of substitutes can be another way to ensure quoracy, although this can be resource intensive for support staff.

Meetings can still “continue” if there are not sufficient members present to constitute a forum. But this will not be a formal meeting of the OSC and such a gathering of members cannot carry out committee business. It may be determined that meetings should go ahead where, for example, an external witness or witnesses are present and cancellation would cause reputational damage and/or a waste of resources. But it will need to be clearly recorded that this was an informal meeting of members being held in public rather than a formal meeting. MCA OSCs’ rules of procedure will need to provide for this, and MCAs will need to think about what it means for officer resourcing of these meetings, given that the fact of inquoracy may only be determined at the very last minute.

These difficulties emphasise why trying to take mitigating action to avoid inquoracy in the first place is always preferable. Given these ongoing challenges, advice on this issue should always be taken from the MCA Monitoring Officer in the runup to meetings, and the MCA should have standing arrangements in place for managing this risk.

### **Building a collaborative mindset: avoiding overt political tension and the need for taking formal votes**

As far as possible the assumption should be made that an MCA OSC will take action through consensus. Scrutiny is a cross-party function and although it will look at political matters, it should not do so in a way that cuts down party political lines.

Avoiding taking formal, recorded votes is a matter for the way that the Chair and committee members work together. Building an independent and collaborative mindset is one way to avoid this need. Frequent, informal communication (likely remote) between committee members is one way to achieve this. Such communication recognises that, with members coming from different local authorities, personal relationships may not be as strong as they might be within a council. This relationship-building work is something that Chairs should actively lead, supported by the scrutiny officer.



77 Mansell Street London E1 8AN

telephone **020 7543 5627** email **info@cfgs.org.uk** twitter **@CfGScrutiny**

**www.cfgs.org.uk**

**Page 55 of 138**

Centre for Governance and Scrutiny Limited is a registered charity: 1136243 and a Limited Company registered in England and Wales: 5133443





## Report title: Review of Overview and Scrutiny Arrangements – Centre for Governance and Scrutiny's Findings & Recommendations

To: Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Meeting Date: 28 June 2021

Public report: Yes

From: Anne Gardiner  
Governance Manager

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee is recommended to:

Recommendations: a) Note the report from Centre for Governance & Scrutiny  
b) Determine whether the proposals within the report should be actioned, with an implementation plan for a revised operating model being brought back to the Committee in July.

Voting arrangements: Simple majority of all members

### 1. Purpose

- 1.1 To provide the Overview and Scrutiny Committee with the report and recommendations from the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny who carried out a review of the current scrutiny arrangements at the CPCA .

### 2. Background

- 2.1 The Centre for Governance and Scrutiny published their second edition on guidance to overview and scrutiny in Combined Authorities. This second edition reflects upon the past three years of practice since the introduction of CA's. It provides guidance around how scrutiny can best operate in practice.

The guidance may be found here: [Revised guidance: Overview and Scrutiny in Combined Authorities - Centre For Governance and Scrutiny \(cfgs.org.uk\)](https://cfgs.org.uk/Revised-guidance-Overview-and-Scrutiny-in-Combined-Authorities)

- 2.2 Following this guidance being published the CPCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee held an informal workshop with CfGS to discuss some of the points raised within the guidance and requested that a proposal be brought forward from CfGS to carry out a review of the current scrutiny arrangements at the CPCA.
- 2.3 The CA Board approved that request and a review was carried out over March and April.
- 2.4 The report from Centre for Governance and Scrutiny is attached at Appendix 1.
- 2.5 It is envisioned that the Committee will continue to operate as they have been with their current working arrangements until proposals for reform are formally adopted and implemented.
- 2.6 Further work with CFGS will be necessary to implement a revised operating model.
- 3. **Financial Implications**
  - 3.1 None
- 4. **Legal Implications**
  - 4.1 None.
- 5. **Appendices**
  - 5.1 Appendix 1 – CfGS Report.
- 6. **Background Papers**
  - 6.1 [O&S March Report](#)
  - 6.2 [O&S March Appendix](#)
  - 6.3 [CA Board Report - March](#)

## Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority

### Scrutiny improvement review (SIR): findings and suggested actions

---

The Centre for Governance and Scrutiny is the leading national organisation for advice, support and guidance on matters relating to corporate governance, constitutional matters, and scrutiny in combined authorities and local authorities. CPCA approached us to conduct a review of the scrutiny arrangements in place at the combined authority. This review was carried out by Ed Hammond (Deputy Chief Executive) with support from Kate Grigg (Senior Policy and Research Officer).

Our findings and suggested actions are set out below, and members are invited to review them and consider how to take them forward.

#### Our method

Our approach followed an amended version of our standard scrutiny improvement review (SIR) methodology. This included examination of:

- **Culture.** The mindset and mentality underpinning the operation of the overview and scrutiny process. This will involve a focus on the CA's corporate approach to scrutiny, and the attitude of those in executive positions to the operation of the function;
- **Information.** How information is prepared, shared, accessed and used in the service of the scrutiny function;
- **Impact.** Ways to ensure that scrutiny is effective, that it makes a tangible difference to the lives of local people.

We:

- Examined the effectiveness of the operating model of scrutiny in the CPCA setting

- Reviewed and considered lessons to be learned from environmental changes and challenges, including ways of working arrangements operating pre-, and since the onset of, the pandemic;
- Gathered general evidence to identify practical improvement actions and innovations which will enable scrutiny to make an impact on the work of the CA and the wider area;
- Looked particularly at:
  - the work of SPVs, trading companies and other commercial activity, and considered the most proportionate way to ensure effective oversight of these arrangements;
  - the terms of reference underpinning the committee's operations;
  - how challenge in committee, and outside it, is made and received;
  - the oversight, and call-in, of key and non-key decisions;
  - the nature of scope of support to scrutiny from senior CA officers.

In reviewing the above we will have particular regard for the need to clarify scrutiny's focus and role.

We carried out this work by way of:

- **Desktop work.** We reviewed recent agendas, minutes and reports, and constitutional material relating to the operation of the scrutiny function. We looked at scrutiny agendas, minutes and reports going back to mid 2019, and papers from selected meetings of the CA Board and the Audit and Governance Committee over the same period;
- **Interviews.** We interviewed 13 members and officers to understand the attitudes and behaviours, and perceptions, that underpin scrutiny work. We tested initial findings informally with a small group of scrutiny committee members;
- **Observation.** We reviewed a small selection of recent webcasts.

## Summary of findings

- In common with the situation in other combined authorities, the combined authority has struggled to find a role for scrutiny. The impact of recent scrutiny work has been limited;
- Scrutiny's focus on the detailed operational oversight of Mayoral decision-making is not the best use of councillors' time and efforts – a new and unique focus for the function is required. This must not however be at the expense of a continued, strong role for the function in holding the Mayor to account;
- The organisation is committed to making the function relevant and effective, and the election of a new Mayor provides an excellent opportunity to recast the function's role and its relationship to the wider authority;

- Scrutiny councillors themselves recognise some of the shortcomings of current ways of working. As in other combined authorities, the bringing together of councillors from across the CA's constituent authorities has made it difficult to pursue a "team" approach to scrutiny despite the efforts of the current chair.
- Councillors have a strong sense of what good scrutiny would look like – and the kinds of issues that they should be examining – but it has proven challenging to convert this aspiration into reality.

## Proposed actions

| Finding   | Associated action  | Timescale and priority   |
|---|--|--|
| <p>The purpose of scrutiny at CA level is poorly understood. This challenge is not unique to CPCA, and was a challenge noted in the informal guidance produced by CfGS on combined authority scrutiny in early 2021.</p> <p>This is due to a range of factors including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall, difficulty in recognising that scrutiny in a combined authority needs to look functionally different to scrutiny in a local authority, because the nature of business and decision-making in a CA is itself different;</li> <li>The difficulty in developing a sense of team working amongst a group of scrutiny members which has changed often, and where members meet infrequently and have other obligations (as we note in more detail below);</li> <li>A political environment where it has not always been possible for scrutiny to engage in their work constructively – not a matter of poor</li> </ul> | <p><b>Action 1: The Chair to convene an informal session for the committee to explore and decide on a renewed and more explicit focus for their work.</b></p> <p>This focus will need to be based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An understanding of the new Mayor's priorities and where opportunities to influence action on those priorities might exist;</li> <li>An awareness of the responsibilities and work programmes of other member forums – in particular, the audit committee and executive committees, and the scrutiny functions of constituent authorities;</li> <li>The need for the committee to continue to robustly hold the Mayor to account, and for the profile of this work to be enhanced.</li> </ul> <p>Following this session the results should be fed informally to the Mayor and CA Board and senior officers to ensure that they have an opportunity to contribute to the recasting of the function. It should be stressed that how scrutiny chooses to change is a matter for scrutiny members themselves.</p> | <p><b>Short term (before summer)</b></p><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><p><b>Short term (beginning September)</b></p> |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p>behaviours but the general political dynamics applying in an environment where there is contention and disagreement;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An organisational environment where CA officers have not had the capacity to work alongside members to reset and redesign the approach, despite a willingness to do so in principle;</li> <li>• An organisational environment which has, since 2017, become increasingly complex (particularly with the establishment of special purpose vehicles for the delivery of certain services)</li> </ul> <p>This has led to the potential of overlap in functions between scrutiny and other parts of the CA – in particular Mayoral committees.</p> | <p><b>Action 2: The Chair, the Mayor and the CA Monitoring Officer to begin meeting regularly to ensure that the strategic purpose of scrutiny is understood and acted on (see also Action 8).</b></p> <p><b>Action 3: When a clear role and purpose for scrutiny can be clearly articulated, work on internal communications to be carried out to ensure that this is understood by the wider CA (including CA Board members and officers).</b></p> <p>In due course it may be that relationships would be assisted through the agreement of a protocol between the scrutiny function and the Mayor/CA, although time should be taken for new arrangements to bed time before action is taken here.</p> <p>The approach described here should feed directly into the approach we suggest below on work programming.</p> | <p><b>Short term (beginning September)</b></p> |
| <p>The challenge in drawing together councillors from across the CA area, and regular changes in membership, means that – the chair aside – members have had little capacity to drive the scrutiny function forward with focus. The convening of meetings remotely during the pandemic enhanced member attendance but did not result in any appreciable change to the nature and impact of scrutiny's work. Members of the committee recognise that a greater commitment of time is necessary to</p>  | <p><b>Action 4: CA officers, in support of the Chair, to engage with constituent councils to better understand</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>how their nominated members can be better supported, and</b></li> <li>• <b>how the business of CA scrutiny can be administered to support members to attend and engage with the work of the function</b></li> </ul> <p>This will inform decisions on work programming, below.</p>   | <p><b>Short term (over August)</b></p>         |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <p>make scrutiny deliver strong and consistent outcomes, but – in common with other CA areas – their commitments at their constituent councils makes their available time very limited.</p> <p>A lack of overall direction meant that scrutiny settled organically on close scrutiny of Mayoral decision-making because it was felt to be tangible and was expedient.</p> <p>This has led scrutiny to look and feel quite operational in nature. It has been difficult to develop an understanding that scrutiny at the combined authority needs to look and feel different to scrutiny at local level.</p>        | <p><b>Action 5: a role profile setting out mutual expectations for scrutiny members – including around information access, support arrangements and requirements around commitment – to be agreed and circulated.</b></p> <p>While this will provide a useful part of an induction process for new members it could also form part of a wider guide to scrutiny at the CA which would be of use to members more generally.</p>  | <p><b>Medium term (autumn, into winter 2021/22)</b></p>  |
| <p>Scrutiny work is generally unprioritised, resting as it does on the rhythm of Mayoral decision-making. Scrutiny has successfully formally held the Mayor and CA to account on many matters – this formal, public accountability is important in its own right and will need to continue in an amended form.</p> <p>As well as work in committee, “task and finish” style work is carried out, although with mixed results. Capacity constraints – relating to both officers and members – have produced challenges.</p> <p>As things stand it is difficult to see how this form of scrutiny has changed the</p> | <p><b>Action 6: a new approach to the sharing of information with scrutiny members which involves:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>an end to the regular sharing, and scrutiny of, Mayoral decisions at committee, with information being shared on an ongoing basis outside of committee to inform the appropriate escalation of issues to committee based on need;</b></li> <li>• <b>more clarity to members in the management of items and reports deemed to be exempt from publication</b></li> <li>• <b>the assignment of individual councillors to act as “rapporteurs”, to develop a subject expertise in specified areas of policy, to highlight issues of importance to the chair for</b></li> </ul> | <p><b>Short term (new agenda arrangements coming into force at the 27 September meeting)</b></p> |

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p>organisation's direction or approach. Scrutiny members themselves recognise that it places significant demands on them to digest and understand large volumes of paperwork, and that the timescales involved in working this way makes scrutiny unlikely to deliver change.</p> <p>Despite the large volume of information being provided, councillors do not always have the right information at hand to allow them to prioritise scrutiny's work effectively. Sometimes, information is made available late in the day, meaning the members have little opportunity to shape decisions. Ultimately, this derives from the ad hoc approach to scrutiny described above, which makes it difficult for officers to provide relevant and timely information to councillors on a proactive or reactive basis.</p> <p>Where members do have access to information they do not use it as effectively as they might. Questioning and discussion at committee struggles to find a focus, although there are examples of where the right people and the right information have been brought together to deliver punchier work which offers hope for the future.</p> | <p><b>escalation to committee and potentially to lead on questioning on such matters.</b></p> <p>Work programming discussions should lead to the use of information to identify one or two substantive items per committee agenda, consideration of which could benefit from external witnesses or the consideration of evidence wider than just officer reports. Scrutiny would discuss matters of strategic concern to the CA and the wider area – linked to Mayoral priorities and decision-making but not directly to the run of decisions in the forward plan.</p> <p>We set out below how the agendas for these meetings would be put together. The subject matter for such agendas would still need to be informed by evidence.</p> <p><b>Action 7: use of shared information, the forward plan and frequent Chair/Mayor/MO conversations to identify forthcoming decisions, and to discuss the developing work programme.</b></p> <p>The parties to this conversation would be able to bring together an awareness of the ongoing business of the audit committee, Mayoral committees and the Business Board. There may be cause to engage in separate bilateral conversations with the chair of the audit committee as time continues. Based on these conversations the Chair and others would agree how and where information on Mayoral / CA activity would be shared with the committee for information, and to inform their judgements on the content of the work programme<sup>1</sup>.</p> | <p><b>Short term (first session to inform 27 September meeting)</b></p> |
|---|---|---|

<sup>1</sup> In local authorities it is generally recommended that a regular "information digest" be prepared containing management information about the authority about its services, allowing members to keep a watching business over such matters. In a combined authority context there is less logic in the preparation of such a document / suite





|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p><b>Action 10: the programming of a regular and general Mayor's Question Time to allow high profile, direct holding to account of the Mayor to continue</b></p> <p>An MQT process would need to be modelled in a way that provides members with support to ask high quality questions at what would be a set piece event. Officer support on questioning would be needed to support these sessions – including the possibility of a committee pre-meeting immediately before the session.</p> <p>Depending on the success in designing this approach (and resting on how the Mayor chooses to make decisions alongside the Board) the scrutiny of CA Board members might also follow this model.</p> <p><b>Action 11: work by the MO and others to consider how scrutiny can productively be engaged in the ongoing governance of SPVs</b></p> <p>This is contingent on the new Mayor making clear how he wishes to take service delivery forwards, and whether SPVs as currently organised provide his preferred mechanism for doing so.</p> | <p><b>Medium term (winter 2021/22)</b></p> |
|--|---|--|

# Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Forward Plan of Executive Decisions

Published 17 June 2021

**The Forward Plan is an indication of future decisions. Please note that it is subject to continual review and may be changed in line with any revisions to the priorities and plans of the CPCA. It is re-published on a monthly basis to reflect such changes.**

## Purpose

The Forward Plan sets out all of the decisions which the Combined Authority Board and Executive Committees will be taking in the coming months. This makes sure that local residents and organisations know what decisions are due to be taken and when.

The Forward Plan is a live document which is updated regularly and published on the [Combined Authority website](#) (click the Forward Plan' button to view). At least 28 clear days' notice will be given of any key decisions to be taken.

## What is a key decision?

A key decision is one which, in the view of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, is likely to:

- i. result in the Combined Authority spending or saving a significant amount, compared with the budget for the service or function the decision relates to (usually £500,000 or more); or
- ii. have a significant effect on communities living or working in an area made up of two or more wards or electoral divisions in the area.

## Non-key decisions and update reports

For transparency, the Forward Plan also includes all non-key decisions and update reports to be considered by the Combined Authority Board and Executive Committees.

## Access to reports

A report will be available to view online one week before a decision is taken. You are entitled to view any documents listed on the Forward Plan after publication, or obtain extracts from any documents listed, subject to any restrictions on disclosure. There is no charge for viewing the documents, although charges may be made for photocopying or postage. Documents listed on this notice can be requested from Robert Parkin, Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer for the Combined Authority at [Robert.Parkin@cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk](mailto:Robert.Parkin@cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk).

The Forward Plan will state if any reports or appendices are likely to be exempt from publication or confidential and may be discussed in private. If you want to make representations that a decision which it is proposed will be taken in private should instead be taken in public please contact Robert Parkin, Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer at [Robert.Parkin@cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk](mailto:Robert.Parkin@cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk) at least five working days before the decision is due to be made.

## Notice of decisions

Notice of the Combined Authority Board's decisions and Executive Committee decisions will be published online within three days of a public meeting taking place.

## Standing items at Executive Committee meetings

The following reports are standing items and will be considered by at each meeting of the relevant committee. The most recently published Forward Plan will also be included on the agenda for each Executive Committee meeting:

### Housing and Communities Committee

1. Affordable Housing Programme Update
2. £100k Homes and Community Land Trusts Update

### Skills Committee

1. Budget and Performance Report
2. Employment and Skills Board Update

### Transport and Infrastructure Committee

1. Budget Monitor Update
2. Performance Report

## Mayoral Decision

|    | Title of report                                   | Decision maker       | Date of decision         | Decision required     | Purpose of report  | Consultation   | Lead officer                                   | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker                                   |
|----|---|----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|----------------------|--|
| 1. | Approval of Allocation of Recycled Growth Funding | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | On or after 15 June 2021 | Key Decision 2021/036 | To approve £2m of unallocated recycled local growth funds to the University of Peterborough Phase 3 project. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders, including the Business Board and members of the Combined Authority Board. | John T Hill<br>Director of Business and Skills | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices |

## Housing and Communities Committee – 21 June 2021

|    | Title of report  | Decision maker                    | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer  | Lead Member   | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker   |
|----|--|-----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 2. | Implementation of the revised Affordable Housing Programme | Housing and Communities Committee | 21 June 2021     | Decision          | To consider proposals for the Affordable Housing Programme following discussions with MHCLG and make recommendations to the Combined Authority Board. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Roger Thompson<br>Director of Housing and Development | Councillor Lewis Herbert<br>Lead Member for Housing | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |
| 3. | Connecting Cambridgeshire Update                           | Housing and Communities Committee | 21 June 2021     | Decision          | To provide an update on the Connecting Cambridgeshire programme.  | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy      | Councillor Lewis Herbert<br>Lead Member for Housing | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |

|    | Title of report                        | Decision maker                    | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report  | Consultation                                | Lead officer  | Lead Member   | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker   |
|----|--|-----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|--|---|---|---|--|
| 4. | Rebel Acres Start-up Grant Application | Housing and Communities Committee | 21 June 2021     | Decision          | To consider and approve Rebel Acres' application for start-up grant funding of £5000 under the Community Land Trust's start-up fund. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Roger Thompson<br>Director of Housing and Development | Councillor Lewis Herbert<br>Lead Member for Housing | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |



## Combined Authority Board Meeting Date – 30 June 2021

### Governance items

|    | Title of report                           | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report  | Consultation                                | Lead officer   | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker                                    |
|----|---|--|------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|----------------------|---|
| 5. | Minutes of the meeting on 2 June 2021     | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 30 June 2021     | Decision          | To approve the minutes of the previous meeting.                | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Richenda Greenhill Democratic Services Officer           | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices. |
| 6. | Forward Plan                              | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 30 June 2021     | Decision          | To approve the latest version of the forward plan.             | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Robert Parkin Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices. |
| 7. | Combined Authority Appointments June 2021 | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough                          | 30 June 2021     | Decision          | To consider any nominations received from constituent councils | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Robert Parkin Chief Legal Officer and                    | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any  |

|    | Title of report                                      | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report   | Consultation  | Lead officer  | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker                                    |
|----|--|--|------------------|-------------------|---|---|---|----------------------|---|
|    |  | Combined Authority Board                                 |                  |                   | or co-opted member organisations.   |   | Monitoring Officer  |                      | documents other than the report and relevant appendices.  |
| 8. | Appointment of the Chief Executive                   | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 30 June 2021     | Decision          | To appoint the chief executive of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders, including the Employment Committee.          | Robert Parkin<br>Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices. |
| 9. | Audit and Governance Committee Annual Report 2020/21 | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 30 June 2021     | Decision          | To receive the Audit and Governance Committee Annual Report 2020/21.                      | Relevant internal and external stakeholders, including the Audit and Governance Committee | Robert Parkin<br>Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices. |

|     | Title of report                 | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required     | Purpose of report  | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker  |
|-----|---------------------------------|--|------------------|-----------------------|--|---|--|----------------------|---|
| 10. | Budget Monitor Report June 2021 | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 30 June 2021     | Key Decision 2021/021 | To note the outturn position for the 2020/21 financial year and approve carry-forwards from the 2020/21 budgets. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Jon Alsop<br>Section 73<br>Chief Finance Officer | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published. |

## Mayoral Decisions

|     | Title of report                                     | Decision maker       | Date of decision | Decision required       | Purpose of report  | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker |
|-----|---|----------------------|------------------|-------------------------|--|---|--|----------------------|--|
| 11. | Local Highways Maintenance Grant Allocation 2021/22 | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | 30 June 2021     | Key Decision KD2021/018 | To approve the Local Highways Maintenance Grant allocations to Cambridgeshire County Council and | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Jon Alsop<br>Section 73<br>Chief Finance Officer | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than  |

|  | Title of report | Decision maker | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report          | Consultation | Lead officer | Lead Member | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker |
|--|-----------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--|
|  |                 |                |                  |                   | Peterborough City Council. |              |              |             | the report and relevant appendices.                                |

### Combined Authority Decisions

|     | Title of report             | Decision maker                         | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker   |
|-----|-----------------------------|--|------------------|-------------------|---|---|--|----------------------|--|
| 12. | East West Rail Consultation | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 30 June 2021     | Decision          | To provide an update on the Combined Authority's response to the East West Rail consultation. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |

|     | Title of report                                     | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required     | Purpose of report  | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker   |
|-----|---|--|------------------|-----------------------|--|---|--|----------------------|--|
| 13. | Bus Services<br><br>[May contain exempt appendices] | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 30 June 2021     | Key Decision 2021/030 | To consider recommendations to authorise officers to work with bus operators on next steps in bus reform including a Bus Services Improvement Plan; apply Department for Transport funding for bus services; and fund public transport improvements. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |
| 14. | Climate Change                                      | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 30 June 2021     | Key Decision 2021/023 | To approve a response to the Independent Commission on Climate's Initial Recommendations.  | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant                            |

|     | Title of report  | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required     | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer                               | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker   |
|-----|--|--|------------------|-----------------------|---|---|--|----------------------|--|
|     |  |  |                  |                       |   |   |  |                      | appendices to be published   |
| 15. | Market Towns Programme Investment Prospectus – Approval of Fifth Tranche of Recommended Projects and change request for Huntingdonshire Funding Timeline Extension | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 30 June 2021     | Key Decision 2021/019 | To approve the fifth tranche of recommended projects under the Market Towns Programme Investment Prospectus and a Huntingdonshire change request to extend project funding timelines. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | John T Hill, Director of Business & Skills | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |
| 16. | Authority to spend for the Greater South East Energy Hub   | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 30 June 2021     | Key Decision 2021/035 | To approve the 'authority to spend' against the Programme budget for the Greater South East Energy Hub in the   | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | John T Hill, Director of Business & Skills | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report   |

|     | Title of report   | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report  | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                   | Lead Member  | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker  |
|-----|---|--|------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|--|---|
|     |   |  |                  |                   | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area.  |   |  |  | and relevant appendices to be published   |
| 17. | Careers Hub   | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 30 June 2021     | Decision          | To approve additional future funding to the Careers Hub.   | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | John T Hill<br>Director of Business and Skills | Councillor Lucy Nethsingha<br>Lead Member for Skills | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published. |
| 18. | European Regional Development Funding (ERDF) Growth Coaching Grants – | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 30 June 2021     | Decision          | To approve a Partner Agreement between the Combined Authority and YTKO (a consortium member delivering | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | John T Hill<br>Director of Business and Skills | Councillor Lucy Nethsingha<br>Lead Member for Skills | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and                                      |

|  | Title of report   | Decision maker | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report           | Consultation | Lead officer | Lead Member | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker |
|--|-------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--|
|  | Partner Agreement |                |                  |                   | the Growth Works contract). |              |              |             | relevant appendices to be published.                               |

## Recommendations from the Housing and Communities Committee

|     | Title of report  | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required     | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer  | Lead Member   | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker                                   |
|-----|--|--|------------------|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 19. | Implementation of the revised Affordable Housing Programme | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 30 June 2021     | Key Decision 2021/022 | To request Board to consider proposals for the Affordable Housing Programme following | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Roger Thompson<br>Director of Housing and Development | Councillor Lewis Herbert<br>Lead Member for Housing | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices |



|  | Title of report | Decision maker | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report       | Consultation | Lead officer | Lead Member | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker |
|--|-----------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--|
|  |                 |                |                  |                   | discussions with MHCLG. |              |              |             | to be published  |

## Recommendations from the Skills Committee

|     | Title of report   | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required     | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                   | Lead Member  | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker                                   |
|-----|---|--|------------------|-----------------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| 20. | Adult Education Budget 2021-22 Funding Allocations and Policy Changes | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 30 June 2021     | Key Decision 2021/020 | To consider proposals for granting delegated authority to award final contract and grant allocations to Adult | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | John T Hill<br>Director of Business and Skills | Councillor Lucy Nethsingha<br>Lead Member for Skills | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices |

|     | Title of report   | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report  | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                   | Lead Member  | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker  |
|-----|---|--|------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|--|---|
|     |   |  |                  |                   | Education Budget (AEB) providers and approve changes to AEB funding policy and rules.      |   |  |  | to be published.  |
| 21. | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Employment and Skills Strategy | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 30 June 2021     | Decision          | To approve the proposed approach to the development of the Employment and Skills Strategy. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | John T Hill<br>Director of Business and Skills | Councillor Lucy Nethsingha<br>Lead Member for Skills | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published. |

## Recommendations from the Business Board

|     | Title of report  | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report   | Consultation  | Lead officer                                | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker   |
|-----|--|--|------------------|-------------------|---|---|---|----------------------|--|
| 22. | Manufacturing and Materials Research and Development Centre Project Change Request and Revised Business Plan | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 30 June 2021     | Decision          | To report Mayoral Decision KD2021/027 to the Combined Authority Board for noting. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders                               | John T Hill, Director of Business & Skills  | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |
| 23. | Community Renewal Fund and Levelling Up Fund Bid Selection Process   | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 30 June 2021     | Decision          | To report Mayoral Decision 35-2021 to the Combined Authority Board for noting.    | Relevant internal and external stakeholders, including the Business Board | John T Hill Director of Business and Skills | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices.                |

|     | Title of report  | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report   | Consultation   | Lead officer                                   | Lead Member                                 | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker  |
|-----|--|--|------------------|-------------------|---|--|--|---|---|
| 24. | Community Renewal Fund (CRF) Final Submission Approval | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 30 June 2021     | Decision          | To note Mayoral Decision 37-2021.   | Relevant internal and external stakeholders  | John T Hill<br>Director of Business and Skills | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson                        | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published. |
| 25. | Approval of Allocation of Recycled Growth Funding      | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 30 June 2021     | Decision          | To report Mayoral Decision 36-2021 (KD2021/036) to the Combined Authority Board for noting. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders, including the Business Board and members of the Combined Authority Board. | John T Hill<br>Director of Business and Skills | Austen Adams<br>Chair of the Business Board | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices                  |

|     | Title of report                   | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                | Lead Member                              | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker  |
|-----|-----------------------------------|--|------------------|-------------------|---|---|---|--|---|
| 26. | Format of Business Board meetings | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 30 June 2021     | Decision          | To consider recommendations on the format of future Business Board meetings following the Business Board's consideration of a recommendation from the Audit and Governance Committee. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | John T Hill, Director of Business & Skills  | Austen Adams Chair of the Business Board | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published  |
| 27. | Sector Strategies                 | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 30 June 2021     | Decision          | To approve and adopt strategies for the Life Sciences, Advanced Manufacturing and Digital Sectors in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.   | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | John T Hill Director of Business and Skills | Austen Adams Chair of the Business Board | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published. |

|     | Title of report                         | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                   | Lead Member                                 | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker  |
|-----|---|--|------------------|-------------------|---|---|--|---|---|
| 28. | Growth Works Management Review May 2021 | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 30 June 2021     | Decision          | To monitor and review programme delivery and performance. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | John T Hill<br>Director of Business and Skills | Austen Adams<br>Chair of the Business Board | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published. |

## Transport and Infrastructure Committee – 14 July 2021

|     | Title of report                              | Decision maker                         | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker   |
|-----|--|--|------------------|-------------------|---|---|--|----------------------|--|
| 29. | CAM Delivery Strategy and Shareholder Report | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 14 July 2021     | Decision          | To consider the proposed Delivery Strategy and funding and financing strategy for the CAM Programme and make recommendations to the Combined Authority Board. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Kim Sawyer<br>Chief Executive                    | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |
| 30. | A141 Engagement                              | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 14 July 2021     | Decision          | To receive an update on results of the engagement.  | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |

|     | Title of report                          | Decision maker                         | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report  | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker   |
|-----|--|--|------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|----------------------|--|
| 31. | Segregated Cycling Study Holme to Sawtry | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 14 July 2021     | Decision          | To consider proposals for funding a Segregated Cycling Study for Holme to Sawtry and make recommendations to the Combined Authority Board. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |
| 32. | Harston Capacity Study                   | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 14 July 2021     | Decision          | To consider proposals for funding a Harston Capacity Study and make recommendations to the Combined Authority Board.                       | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |



|     | Title of report                   | Decision maker                         | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report  | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker   |
|-----|-----------------------------------|--|------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|----------------------|--|
| 33. | A142 Chatteris to Snailwell Study | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 14 July 2021     | Decision          | To consider proposals for funding an A142 to Snailwell study and make recommendations to the Combined Authority Board. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |
| 34. | Sawston Station Study             | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 14 July 2021     | Decision          | To consider proposals for funding a Sawston Station Study and make recommendations to the Combined Authority Board.    | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |

|     | Title of report                         | Decision maker                         | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report             | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker   |
|-----|---|--|------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|----------------------|--|
| 35. | Cambridge South Station Progress Update | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 14 July 2021     | Decision          | To provide a progress update. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |
| 36. | Soham Station Progress Update           | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 14 July 2021     | Decision          | To provide a progress update. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |

|     | Title of report   | Decision maker                         | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report  | Consultation  | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker   |
|-----|---|--|------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|----------------------|--|
| 37. | Independent Audit of Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport Project | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 14 July 2021     | Decision          | To consider an independent audit of the Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport Project                             | Relevant internal and external stakeholders including the Greater Cambridge Partnership | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |
| 38. | A505  | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 14 July 2021     | Decision          | To receive the Pre-Strategic Outline Business case and make recommendations to the Combined Authority Board on next steps. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders   | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |

|     | Title of report                                  | Decision maker                         | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report  | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker   |
|-----|--|--|------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|----------------------|--|
| 39. | A10 Junctions and Dualling Outline Business Case | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 14 July 2021     | Decision          | The update the committee on the next stage for development of the Outline Business Case for the A10 and financial approvals required and make recommendations to the Combined Authority Board. . | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |

## Combined Authority Board – 28 July 2021

### Governance items

|     | Title of report                           | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer   | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker                                    |
|-----|---|--|------------------|-------------------|---|---|--|----------------------|---|
| 40. | Minutes of the meeting on 30 June 2021    | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 28 July 2021     | Decision          | To approve the minutes of the previous meeting.             | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Richenda Greenhill, Democratic Services Officer          | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices. |
| 41. | Forward Plan                              | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 28 July 2021     | Decision          | To approve the latest version of the forward plan.          | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Robert Parkin Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices. |
| 42. | Advertisement and Appointment Process for | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough                          | 28 July 2021     | Decision          | To approve the recommendation from the Audit and Governance | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Robert Parkin Chief Legal                                | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any  |

|     | Title of report  | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report  | Consultation  | Lead officer   | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker                                    |
|-----|--|--|------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|----------------------|---|
|     | Two Independent Persons  | Combined Authority Board                                 |                  |                   | Committee to undertake an advertisement and appointment process for two independent persons in regard to Member Conduct.   | including the Audit and Governance Committee  | Officer and Monitoring Officer                           |                      | documents other than the report and relevant appendices.  |
| 43. | Appointment of Independent Remuneration Panel to review Members Allowance Scheme | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 28 July 2021     | Decision          | To invite the Combined Authority Board to agree that an Independent Remuneration Panel be requested to review the Members' Allowances Scheme in relation to the Mayor's allowance. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders, including the Audit and Governance Committee | Robert Parkin Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices. |
| 44. | Corporate Risk Management Strategy and Risk Register                             | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 30 June 2021     | Decision          | To review and approve the Corporate Risk Management  | Relevant internal and external stakeholders, including the                                | Robert Parkin Chief Legal Officer and                    | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents  |

|     | Title of report       | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker  |
|-----|-----------------------|--|------------------|-------------------|---|---|--|----------------------|---|
|     |                       |  |                  |                   | Strategy and Risk Register.   | Audit and Governance Committee              | Monitoring Officer                               |                      | other than the report and relevant appendices.  |
| 45. | Budget Monitor Update | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 28 July 2031     | Decision          | To provide an update on the revenue and capital budgets for the year to date. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Jon Alsop<br>Section 73<br>Chief Finance Officer | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published. |
| 46. | Performance Report    | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 28 July 2021     | Decision          | To note the Combined Authority performance reporting Dashboard.               | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices                  |

|  | Title of report | Decision maker | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report | Consultation | Lead officer | Lead Member | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker |
|--|-----------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--|
|  |                 |                |                  |                   |                   |              |              |             | to be published.   |

## Combined Authority Decisions

|     | Title of report                  | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer                        | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker                                    |
|-----|----------------------------------|--|------------------|-------------------|---|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 47. | CAM Shareholder Report           | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 28 July 2021     | Decision          | To consider the CAM Shareholder report                                    | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Chief Executive                     | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices. |
| 48. | Development of Key Route Network | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough                          | 28 July 2021     | Decision          | To consider proposals for funding the development of a Key Route Network. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any  |



|     | Title of report  | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required       | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                   | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker                                    |
|-----|--|--|------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|----------------------|---|
|     |  | Combined Authority Board                                 |                  |                         |   |   | and Strategy                                   |                      | documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published                               |
| 49. | Mayoral Capacity Fund                                      | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 28 July 2021     | Decision                | To request approval for £350k of funding from the Mayoral Capacity Fund to finance the four key costs in relation to mobilisation and enabling planning applications for Phase 3 of the University of Peterborough. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | John T Hill<br>Director of Business and Skills | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices. |
| 50. | Market Towns Programme Investment Prospectus – Approval of | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 28 July 2021     | Key Decision KD2021/017 | To approve the final tranche of recommended projects under the Market Towns Programme   | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | John T Hill<br>Director of Business and Skills | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than                                     |

|     | Title of report   | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required       | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                   | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker                                    |
|-----|---|--|------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|----------------------|---|
|     | Final Tranche of Recommended Projects and Change Request for St Neots and Littleport Funding Timeline Extensions. |  |                  |                         | Investment Prospectus and change requests from Huntingdonshire and East Cambridgeshire to extend project funding timelines.   |   |  |                      | the report and relevant appendices.   |
| 51. | March – Future High Streets Funding Bid: Additional Combined Authority Match Funding                              | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 28 July 2021     | Key Decision KD2021/037 | To consider an application received from Fenland District Council to request Combined Authority match funding towards the Government approved March Future High Street Fund scheme. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | John T Hill<br>Director of Business and Skills | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices. |

## By recommendation to the Combined Authority Board

### Recommendations from the Transport and Infrastructure Committee

|     | Title of report                              | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker   |
|-----|--|--|------------------|-------------------|---|---|--|----------------------|--|
| 52. | CAM Delivery Strategy and Shareholder Report | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 28 July 2021     | Decision          | To sign off the Delivery Strategy and funding and financing strategy for the CAM Programme. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Kim Sawyer<br>Chief Executive                    | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices.                |
| 53. | Segregated Cycling Study Holme to Sawtry     | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 28 July 2021     | Decision          | To consider proposals for funding a Segregated Cycling Study for Holme to Sawtry.           | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |

|     | Title of report                   | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker   |
|-----|-----------------------------------|--|------------------|-------------------|---|---|--|----------------------|--|
| 54. | Harston Capacity Study            | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 28 July 2021     | Decision          | To seek approval of funding for Harston Capacity Study.       | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |
| 55. | A142 Chatteris to Snailwell Study | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 28 July 2021     | Decision          | To consider proposals for funding an A142 to Snailwell study. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |

|     | Title of report                                  | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required     | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker   |
|-----|--|--|------------------|-----------------------|---|---|--|----------------------|--|
| 56. | A505   | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 28 July 2021     | Decision              | To receive the Pre-Strategic Outline Business case decide next steps.                                     | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |
| 57. | A10 Junctions and Dualling Outline Business Case | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 28 July 2021     | Key Decision 2021/040 | The seek financial approvals for the next stage for development of the Outline Business Case for the A10. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |

## Recommendations from the Business Board

|     | Title of report                                 | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer                               | Lead Member                              | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker   |
|-----|---|--|------------------|-------------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| 58. | Strategic Funding Management Review – July 2021 | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 28 July 2021     | Decision          | To monitor and review programme performance, evaluation, outcomes and risks.                  | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | John T Hill, Director of Business & Skills | Austen Adams Chair of the Business Board | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |
| 59. | Business Board Annual Report and Delivery Plan  | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 28 July 2021     | Decision          | To approve the Business Board Annual Report for 2020-21 and Annual Delivery Plan for 2021-22. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | John T Hill, Director of Business & Skills | Austen Adams Chair of the Business Board | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |
| 60. | Business Board Expenses                         | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough                          | 28 July 2021     | Decision          | To approve the updated  | Relevant internal and                       | John T Hill, Director of                   | Austen Adams Chair of the                | It is not anticipated that there   |

|  | Title of report       | Decision maker           | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report                       | Consultation          | Lead officer      | Lead Member    | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker                  |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------------------|---|-----------------------|-------------------|----------------|---|
|  | and Allowances Scheme | Combined Authority Board |                  |                   | Business Board Member Allowance Scheme. | external stakeholders | Business & Skills | Business Board | will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |

### Housing and Communities Committee – 6 September 2021

|     | Title of report  | Decision maker                    | Date of decision | Decision required     | Purpose of report  | Consultation                                | Lead officer  | Lead Member   | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker           |
|-----|--|-----------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|--|---|---|---|--|
| 61. | Affordable Housing Programme Scheme Approvals – September 2021 | Housing and Communities Committee | 6 September 2021 | Key Decision 2021/012 | To consider and approve allocations to new schemes within the Affordable | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Roger Thompson<br>Director of Housing and Development | Councillor Lewis Herbert<br>Lead Member for Housing | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report |

|     | Title of report                           | Decision maker                    | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report  | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member   | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker   |
|-----|---|-----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|---|--|
|     |   |                                   |                  |                   | House Programme.   |   |  |   | and relevant appendices to be published.   |
| 62. | Connecting Cambridgeshire Strategy Review | Housing and Communities Committee | 6 September 2021 | Decision          | To provide an update on to targets and future direction of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Digital Connectivity Infrastructure strategy for 2021-2025. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Councillor Lewis Herbert<br>Lead Member for Housing | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |



## Transport and Infrastructure Committee – 8 September 2021

|     | Title of report             | Decision maker                         | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report  | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker  |
|-----|-----------------------------|--|------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|----------------------|---|
| 63. | Local Transport Plan Update | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 8 September 2021 | Decision          | To provide an update on the Local Transport Plan refresh.                        | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published. |
| 64. | E-Scooter and E-Bike Update | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 8 September 2021 | Decision          | To provide an update on the scheme and Department for Transport survey outcomes. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and                                      |

|     |  |  |                  |          |   |   |  |                      |   |
|-----|--|--|------------------|----------|---|---|--|----------------------|---|
|     |  |  |                  |          |   |   |  |                      | relevant appendices to be published.  |
| 65. | Bus Strategy                           | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 8 September 2021 | Decision | To provide an update on National Bus Strategy work. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published. |
| 66. | Transforming Cities Fund Annual Report | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 8 September 2021 | Decision | To note the Transforming Cities Annual Report.      | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published  |

## Skills Committee – 13 September 2021

|     | Title of report  | Decision maker   | Date of decision  | Decision required | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                   | Lead Member  | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker  |
|-----|--|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---|---|--|--|---|
| 67. | Opportunities to develop the Greater South East Energy Hub | Skills Committee | 13 September 2021 | Decision          | To note the accountable body and Business Plan for the Greater South East Energy Hub, including opportunities for a green supply chain and skills requirements. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | John T Hill<br>Director of Business and Skills | Councillor Lucy Nethsingha<br>Lead Member for Skills | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published. |

## Combined Authority Board – 29 September 2021

### Governance items

|     | Title of report                        | Decision maker   | Date of decision  | Decision required | Purpose of report                                  | Consultation                                | Lead officer   | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker                                    |
|-----|--|--|-------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|----------------------|---|
| 68. | Minutes of the meeting on 28 July 2021 | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 29 September 2021 | Decision          | To approve the minutes of the previous meeting.    | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Richenda Greenhill, Democratic Services Officer          | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices. |
| 69. | Forward Plan                           | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 29 September 2021 | Decision          | To approve the latest version of the forward plan. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Robert Parkin Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices. |

|     | Title of report       | Decision maker   | Date of decision  | Decision required | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker  |
|-----|-----------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------|---|---|--|----------------------|---|
| 70. | Budget Monitor Update | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 29 September 2031 | Decision          | To provide an update on the revenue and capital budgets for the year to date. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Jon Alsop<br>Section 73<br>Chief Finance Officer | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published. |

## Combined Authority Decisions

|     | Title of report        | Decision maker   | Date of decision  | Decision required | Purpose of report                      | Consultation                                | Lead officer    | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker                                    |
|-----|------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------|--|---|-----------------|----------------------|---|
| 71. | CAM Shareholder Report | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 29 September 2021 | Decision          | To consider the CAM Shareholder report | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Chief Executive | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices. |

## By recommendation to the Combined Authority

### Recommendations from the Transport and Infrastructure Committee

|  | Title of report | Decision maker | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report | Consultation | Lead officer | Lead Member | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker |
|--|-----------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--|
|  |                 |                |                  |                   |                   |              |              |             |  |

|     |              |  |                   |                       |   |   |  |                      |   |
|-----|--------------|--|-------------------|-----------------------|---|---|--|----------------------|---|
|     |              |  |                   |                       |   |   |  |                      |   |
| 72. | Bus Strategy | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 29 September 2021 | Key Decision 2021/034 | To provide an update on National Bus Strategy work. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published. |

## Recommendations from the Skills Committee

|     |  |  |                   |          |   |   |   |  |  |
|-----|--|--|-------------------|----------|---|---|---|--|--|
| 73. | Opportunities to develop the Greater South East Energy Hub | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 29 September 2021 | Decision | To note the opportunities for a green supply chain and skills requirements in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | John T Hill,<br>Director of Business & Skills | Councillor Lucy Nethsingha<br>Lead Member for Skills | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |
|-----|--|--|-------------------|----------|---|---|---|--|--|

## Recommendations from the Business Board

|     | Title of report  | Decision maker   | Date of decision  | Decision required | Purpose of report  | Consultation                                | Lead officer                               | Lead Member                              | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker   |
|-----|--|--|-------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| 74. | Combined Authority Implications of the Local Enterprise Partnership Review | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 29 September 2021 | Decision          | To note the outcomes of Government's national Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) Review. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | John T Hill, Director of Business & Skills | Austen Adams Chair of the Business Board | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published |
| 75. | Enterprise Zones Programme Update  | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 29 September 2021 | Decision          | To update the Board on the Enterprise Zones Programme.                                   | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | John T Hill, Director of Business & Skills | Austen Adams Chair of the Business Board | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant                            |



|  | Title of report | Decision maker | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report | Consultation | Lead officer | Lead Member | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker |
|--|-----------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--|
|  |                 |                |                  |                   |                   |              |              |             | appendices to be published   |

### Housing and Communities Committee – 3 November 2021

|     | Title of report                                | Decision maker                    | Date of decision | Decision required     | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer  | Lead Member              | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker |
|-----|--|-----------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|---|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| 76. | Affordable Housing Programme Scheme Approvals: | Housing and Communities Committee | 3 November 2021  | Key Decision 2021/013 | To consider and approve allocations to new schemes within the | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Roger Thompson<br>Director of Housing and Development | Councillor Lewis Herbert | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents             |

|  | Title of report | Decision maker | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report           | Consultation | Lead officer | Lead Member             | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker |
|--|-----------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|--|
|  | November 2021   |                |                  |                   | Affordable House Programme. |              |              | Lead Member for Housing | other than the report and relevant appendices to be published.     |

### Transport and Infrastructure Committee – 8 November 2021

|     | Title of report                    | Decision maker                         | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report  | Consultation                                | Lead officer                        | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker |
|-----|------------------------------------|--|------------------|-------------------|--|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 77. | March Area Transport Study Outline | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 8 November 2021  | Decision          | To consider the Outline Business Case and make recommendations to the Combined | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents             |

|     | Title of report             | Decision maker                         | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker  |
|-----|-----------------------------|--|------------------|-------------------|---|---|--|----------------------|---|
|     | Business Case               |  |                  |                   | Authority Board on the next stage of the project.           |   | and Strategy                                     |                      | other than the report and relevant appendices to be published.  |
| 78. | Local Transport Plan Update | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 8 November 2021  | Decision          | To provide an update on the Local Transport Plan refresh.   | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published. |
| 79. | Wisbech Rail Update         | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 8 November 2021  | Decision          | To provide an update on the project and outline next steps. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than   |

|     | Title of report                         | Decision maker                         | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker  |
|-----|---|--|------------------|-------------------|---|---|--|----------------------|---|
|     |   |  |                  |                   |   |   |  |                      | the report and relevant appendices to be published.   |
| 80. | A1260 Nene Parkway Junction 15          | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 8 November 2021  | Decision          | To consider the Full Business Case and a request to approve the drawdown construction funds and make recommendations to the Combined Authority Board. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published. |
| 81. | St Ives Strategic Outline Business Case | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 8 November 2021  | Decision          | To review outcomes from the Strategic Outline Business Case and next steps and make recommendations   | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report  |

|     | Title of report                      | Decision maker                         | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker  |
|-----|--------------------------------------|--|------------------|-------------------|---|---|--|----------------------|---|
|     |                                      |  |                  |                   | to the Combined Authority Board.  |   |  |                      | and relevant appendices to be published.  |
| 82. | A141 Strategic Outline Business Case | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 8 November 2021  | Decision          | To review outcomes from the Strategic Outline Business Case and make recommendations of next steps to the Combined Authority Board. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published. |

## Combined Authority Board – 24 November 2021

### Governance Items

|     | Title of report                             | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report                                  | Consultation                                | Lead officer   | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker                                    |
|-----|---|--|------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|----------------------|---|
| 83. | Minutes of the meeting on 29 September 2021 | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 24 November 2021 | Decision          | To approve the minutes of the previous meeting.    | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Richenda Greenhill, Democratic Services Officer          | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices. |
| 84. | Forward Plan                                | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 24 November 2021 | Decision          | To approve the latest version of the forward plan. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Robert Parkin Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices. |
| 85. | Budget Monitor Update                       | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough                          | 24 November 2021 | Decision          | To provide an update on the revenue and capital    | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Jon Alsop Section 73 Chief                               | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any  |

|     | Title of report    | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report  | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker  |
|-----|--------------------|--|------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|----------------------|---|
|     |                    | Combined Authority Board                                 |                  |                   | budgets for the year to date.                                  |   | Finance Officer                                  |                      | documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published.  |
| 86. | Performance Report | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 24 November 2021 | Decision          | To note the Combined Authority performance reporting Dashboard | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published. |

## Combined Authority Decisions

|     | Title of report  | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required     | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker  |
|-----|--|--|------------------|-----------------------|---|---|--|----------------------|---|
| 87. | CAM Shareholder Report                                   | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 24 November 2021 | Decision              | To consider the CAM Shareholder report  | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Chief Executive                                  | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices.                 |
| 88. | Response to the Independent Commission on Climate Change | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 24 November 2021 | Key Decision 2021/025 | To approve a response to the Independent Commission on Climate Change's full recommendations. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published. |



## By recommendation to the Combined Authority

### Recommendations from the Transport and Infrastructure Committee

|     | Title of report                                  | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required     | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker  |
|-----|--|--|------------------|-----------------------|---|---|--|----------------------|---|
| 89. | March Area Transport Study Outline Business Case | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 24 November 2021 | Key Decision 2021/026 | To receive the Outline Business Case and decide on the next stage of the project. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices.                 |
| 90. | Wisbech Rail Update                              | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 24 November 2021 | Decision              | To provide an update on the project and outline next steps.                       | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published. |

|     | Title of report                         | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required     | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker  |
|-----|---|--|------------------|-----------------------|---|---|--|----------------------|---|
| 91. | St Ives Strategic Outline Business Case | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 24 November 2021 | Decision              | To review outcomes from the Strategic Outline Business Case and recommended next steps. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published. |
| 92. | A1260 Nene Parkway Junction 15          | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 24 November 2021 | Key Decision 2021/032 | To consider the Full Business Case and a request to approve the drawdown construction.  | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published. |

|     | Title of report                      | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report  | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker  |
|-----|--------------------------------------|--|------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|----------------------|---|
| 93. | A141 Strategic Outline Business Case | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 24 November 2021 | Decision          | To review outcomes from the Strategic Outline Business Case and recommendations on next steps. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published. |

### Housing and Communities Committee – 10 January 2022

|     | Title of report                     | Decision maker                    | Date of decision | Decision required     | Purpose of report                                  | Consultation                                | Lead officer   | Lead Member              | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker |
|-----|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|--|---|----------------|--------------------------|--|
| 94. | Affordable Housing Programme Scheme | Housing and Communities Committee | 10 January 2022  | Key Decision 2021/038 | To consider and approve allocations to new schemes | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Roger Thompson | Councillor Lewis Herbert | It is not anticipated that there will be any                       |

|  |                              |  |  |  |   |  |   |                               |   |
|--|------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|---|-------------------------------|---|
|  | Approvals<br>January<br>2022 |  |  |  | within the<br>Affordable<br>House<br>Programme. |  | Director of<br>Housing and<br>Development | Lead<br>Member for<br>Housing | documents<br>other than<br>the report<br>and<br>relevant<br>appendices. |
|--|------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|---|-------------------------------|---|

### Transport and Infrastructure Committee – 12 January 2022

|     | Title of report             | Decision maker                         | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report  | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker                                    |
|-----|-----------------------------|--|------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|----------------------|---|
| 95. | Local Transport Plan Update | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 12 January 2022  | Decision          | To provide an update on the Local Transport Plan refresh following consultation. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices. |
| 96. | University Access Study     | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 12 January 2022  | Decision          | To consider recommendations on the Outline Business Case                         | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery              | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any  |

|     | Title of report               | Decision maker                         | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report  | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker                                    |
|-----|-------------------------------|--|------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|----------------------|---|
|     |                               |  |                  |                   | Phase 1 and outline next steps and make recommendations to the Combined Authority Board.                 |   | and Strategy                                     |                      | documents other than the report and relevant appendices.  |
| 97. | A47 Dualling                  | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 12 January 2022  | Decision          | To summarise outcome of the Highways England Review and outline next steps.                              | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices. |
| 98. | Fenland Stations Regeneration | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 12 January 2022  | Decision          | To give an update on construction completion of March and Manea stations as part of the Fenland Stations | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and                      |

|  | Title of report | Decision maker | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report       | Consultation | Lead officer | Lead Member | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker |
|--|-----------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--|
|  |                 |                |                  |                   | Regeneration programme. |              |              |             | relevant appendices.   |

## Combined Authority Board – 26 January 2022

### Governance Items

|     | Title of report                            | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report                               | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                    | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker                                    |
|-----|--|--|------------------|-------------------|---|---|---|----------------------|---|
| 99. | Minutes of the meeting on 24 November 2021 | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 26 January 2022  | Decision          | To approve the minutes of the previous meeting. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Richenda Greenhill, Democratic Services Officer | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices. |

|      | Title of report       | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer  | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker  |
|------|-----------------------|--|------------------|-------------------|---|---|---|----------------------|---|
| 100. | Forward Plan          | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 26 January 2022  | Decision          | To approve the latest version of the forward plan.                            | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Robert Parkin<br>Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices.                 |
| 101. | Budget Monitor Update | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 26 January 2022  | Decision          | To provide an update on the revenue and capital budgets for the year to date. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Jon Alsop<br>Section 73 Chief Finance Officer               | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published. |
| 102. | Performance Report    | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 26 January 2022  | Decision          | To note the Combined Authority performance                                    | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery                         | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents  |

|  | Title of report | Decision maker | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report   | Consultation | Lead officer | Lead Member | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker |
|--|-----------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--|
|  |                 |                |                  |                   | reporting Dashboard |              | and Strategy |             | other than the report and relevant appendices to be published.     |

## Combined Authority Decisions

|      | Title of report        | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report                       | Consultation                                | Lead officer    | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker                                    |
|------|------------------------|--|------------------|-------------------|---|---|-----------------|----------------------|---|
| 103. | CAM Shareholder Report | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 26 January 2022  | Decision          | To consider the CAM Shareholder report. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Chief Executive | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices. |



## By recommendation to the Combined Authority Board

### Recommendations from the Transport and Infrastructure Committee

|      | Title of report         | Decision maker                         | Date of decision | Decision required     | Purpose of report  | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker                                    |
|------|-------------------------|--|------------------|-----------------------|--|---|--|----------------------|---|
| 104. | University Access Study | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 26 January 2022  | Key Decision 2021/031 | To consider recommendations on the Outline Business Case Phase 1 and outline next steps. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices. |
| 105. | A47 Dualling            | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 26 January 2022  | Decision              | To summarise outcome of the Highways England Review and outline next steps.              | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices. |

## Housing and Communities Committee – 9 March 2022

|      | Title of report  | Decision maker                    | Date of decision | Decision required     | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer  | Lead Member   | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker                                    |
|------|--|-----------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 106. | Affordable Housing Programme Scheme Approvals March 2022 | Housing and Communities Committee | 9 March 2022     | Key Decision 2021/039 | To consider and approve allocations to new schemes within the Affordable House Programme. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Roger Thompson<br>Director of Housing and Development | Councillor Lewis Herbert<br>Lead Member for Housing | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices. |
| 107. | Northern Fringe Progress Report                          | Housing and Communities Committee | 9 March 2022     | Decision              | To receive a progress report on the Northern Fringe.                                      | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Roger Thompson<br>Director of Housing and Development | Councillor Lewis Herbert<br>Lead Member for Housing | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices. |

## Transport and Infrastructure Committee – 14 March 2022

|      | Title of report           | Decision maker                         | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker                                    |
|------|---------------------------|--|------------------|-------------------|---|---|--|----------------------|---|
| 108. | Local Transport Plan 2022 | Transport and Infrastructure Committee | 14 March 2022    | Decision          | To consider the Local Transport Plan refreshed document and make recommendations to the Combined Authority Board. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices. |

## Combined Authority Board – 30 March 2022

### Governance Items

|      | Title of report              | Decision maker                  | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report                               | Consultation                                | Lead officer                      | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker |
|------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 109. | Minutes of the meeting on 26 | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough | 30 March 2022    | Decision          | To approve the minutes of the previous meeting. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Richenda Greenhill,<br>Democratic | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any                       |

|      | Title of report       | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required | Purpose of report   | Consultation                                | Lead officer  | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker  |
|------|-----------------------|--|------------------|-------------------|---|---|---|----------------------|---|
|      | January 2022          | Combined Authority Board                                 |                  |                   |   |   | Services Officer  |                      | documents other than the report and relevant appendices.  |
| 110. | Forward Plan          | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 30 March 2022    | Decision          | To approve the latest version of the forward plan.                            | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Robert Parkin<br>Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices.                 |
| 111. | Budget Monitor Update | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 30 March 2022    | Decision          | To provide an update on the revenue and capital budgets for the year to date. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Jon Alsop<br>Section 73 Chief Finance Officer               | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices to be published. |

## By recommendation to the Combined Authority Board

### Recommendations from the Transport and Infrastructure Committee

|      | Title of report           | Decision maker   | Date of decision | Decision required     | Purpose of report                                       | Consultation                                | Lead officer                                     | Lead Member          | Documents relevant to the decision submitted to the decision maker                                    |
|------|---------------------------|--|------------------|-----------------------|---|---|--|----------------------|---|
| 112. | Local Transport Plan 2022 | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board | 30 March 2022    | Key Decision 2021/033 | To approve the Local Transport Plan refreshed document. | Relevant internal and external stakeholders | Paul Raynes<br>Director of Delivery and Strategy | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson | It is not anticipated that there will be any documents other than the report and relevant appendices. |

## Comments or queries about the Forward Plan to Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority

Please send your comments or queries to Robert Parkin, Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer, at [Robert.Parkin@cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk](mailto:Robert.Parkin@cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk) . We need to know:

1. Your comment or query:
2. How can we contact you with a response (please include your name, a telephone number and your email address).
3. Who you would like to respond to your query.



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE  
& PETERBOROUGH**  
COMBINED AUTHORITY

Agenda Item No: 10

## Report title: Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme

To: Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Meeting Date: 28 June 2021

Public report: Yes

From: Anne Gardiner  
Scrutiny Officer

Recommendations: Discuss and agree items that they would like to be added to the work programme for the Overview & Scrutiny Committee for the 2021/22 municipal year.

Voting arrangements: N/A

### 1. Purpose

- 1.1 To ask the committee to comment and make suggestions on the work programme for the interim period while the proposed scrutiny arrangements are put in place.

### 2. Background

- 2.1 In accordance with the Constitution, the Overview & Scrutiny Committee is responsible for setting its own work programme.
- 2.2 A draft work programme which shows the items to be considered over the forthcoming year is attached at Appendix 1.
- 2.3 Members of the Committee are asked to discuss and agree the items for the work programme for the next municipal year, and their prioritisation, and to comment as appropriate on what resources may be required.

### 3. Financial Implications

3.1 No financial implications

## 4. Legal Implications

4.1 No legal implications.

## 5. Appendices

6.1 Appendix 1 – Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme



## Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme 2021/2022

| Meeting Date                             | Item                              | Comments |
|--|-----------------------------------|----------|
| To be scheduled for 21/22 work programme |                                   |          |
|  | University of Peterborough Update |          |

