

———— Delivering our City Deal ————

PAGES

Public Questions and Responses Joint Assembly 20 September 2018

1 - 2



Appendix A to the minutes of the 20th September 2018 meeting of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly – Public Questions

Questioner	Question	Response
	LLFs – Information and Communication	
Councillor Dr Jocelynne Scutt, Chair of Milton Road Local Liaison Forum (LLF)	Milton Road Local Liaison Forum has worked closely with Milton Road Project officers and consultants. The expertise of members — particularly Milton Road Residents' Association and Hurst Park Estate Residents Association representatives and their members — has been key in ensuring that the Project is optimally shaped to meet Greater Cambridge Partnership objectives consistent with Milton Road's (and surrounding streets') character as a residential area, in addition to Milton Road's being a major link between Cambridge City and outer-lying areas. The Consultation stage has now been reached as publicised by Twitter and on YouTube. Members of the LLF, Residents Associations and residents have contacted me as chair of the LLF expressing concern that they learned of the Consultation's commencement through the Twitter and You-Tube publicity rather than by direct communication from the Greater Cambridge Partnership and that they had no role in the consultation format. The GPC Engagement and LLF Review states an intention to provide a greater leadin time 'to adequately plan and secure stakeholder buy-in [sic] prior to public consultation'. This has not resulted in engagement with Milton Road LLF and particularly Residents' Associations. This appears to have been subjugated to 'focus groups', the 'Community Sounding Board' and 'key stakeholders'. Surely the latter must include the LLF and Residents' Associations — at least their representatives on LLFs? As LLF Chair I was notified by the GCP of the imminent release of the Milton Road Project consultation document. However, it was in its final form, no consultation occurring prior to this and not with the LLF or Residents Associations. Does the Greater Cambridge Partnership recognise that this is not best practice and ensure that in the future — to ensure 'buy-in' — such planning includes as 'key stakeholders' LLFs and particularly Residents' Associations or at least their	The Partnership is committed to engaging with local communities and recognises the valuable contribution local residents can make to the development of a scheme, bringing as they do detailed knowledge of the area in which they live. The GCP is particularly mindful of the constructive engagement work that took place with the Milton Road LLF in respect of the Milton Road project and believes that the designs now being consulted on are testament to the extent of community contribution, as Cllr Scutt points out. The reference to GCP's intention to provide a greater lead-in time 'to adequately plan and secure stakeholder buy-in prior to public consultation relates to the scheme as a whole, not to consultation exercises. To this end, GCP officers and the consultants spent significant time holding community meetings and workshops with members of the LLF to finesse the final scheme design. In preparing consultation materials the GCP will, as far as is practicable, sense check these for presentation and legibility only, not for any changes to the design. This will include discussion with LLF Chairs/Vice Chairs and other external stakeholders prior to publication if we are able to. But it is not practicable to seek to agree consultation materials with everyone who might be interested beforehand – the GCP has to own that process and take responsibility for it. The opportunity to engage more widely and obtain feedback comes from the consultation process itself. In terms of the reference to the community sounding board, these discussions took place with the best of intentions in order to have a wider reach of engagement with a range of different groups in the area. The sounding board has no official role in the consultation or any decision making remit. It was simply a way of bringing together a range of people with different views. The GCP's intention is to enhance engagement activity, not to constrain it and is very aware of the excellent contribution which the LLF has made to the development of the Milton Road Scheme.
	Councillor Dr Jocelynne Scutt, Chair of Milton Road Local Liaison Forum	Milton Road Local Liaison Forum has worked closely with Milton Road Project officers and consultants. The expertise of members – particularly Milton Road Residents' Association and Hurst Park Estate Residents Association representatives and their members – has been key in ensuring that the Project is optimally shaped to meet Greater Cambridge Partnership objectives consistent with Milton Road's (and surrounding streets') character as a residential area, in addition to Milton Road's being a major link between Cambridge City and outer-lying areas. The Consultation stage has now been reached as publicised by Twitter and on YouTube. Members of the LLF, Residents Associations and residents have contacted me as chair of the LLF expressing concern that they learned of the Consultation's commencement through the Twitter and You-Tube publicity rather than by direct communication from the Greater Cambridge Partnership and that they had no role in the consultation format. The GPC Engagement and LLF Review states an intention to provide a greater leadin time 'to adequately plan and secure stakeholder buy-in [sic] prior to public consultation'. This has not resulted in engagement with Milton Road LLF and particularly Residents' Associations. This appears to have been subjugated to 'focus groups', the 'Community Sounding Board' and 'key stakeholders'. Surely the latter must include the LLF and Residents' Associations – at least their representatives on LLFs? As LLF Chair I was notified by the GCP of the imminent release of the Milton Road Project consultation document. However, it was in its final form, no consultation occurring prior to this and not with the LLF or Residents Associations. Does the Greater Cambridge Partnership recognise that this is not best practice and ensure that in the future – to ensure 'buy-in' – such planning includes as 'key

This page is left blank intentionally.