



GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP

Growing and sharing prosperity

Delivering our City Deal

GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP JOINT ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
2.00pm Wednesday 13th September 2017
South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne

PRESENT:

Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly:

Councillor Kevin Price	Cambridge City Council (Chairman)
Councillor Tim Wotherspoon	Cambridgeshire County Council (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Dave Baigent	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Tim Bick	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Noel Kavanagh	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor John Williams	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Kevin Cuffley	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Grenville Chamberlain	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Bridget Smith	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Sir Michael Marshall	Marshall Group
Claire Ruskin	Cambridge Network
Andy Williams	AstraZeneca
Mark Robertson	Cambridge Regional College
Helen Valentine	Anglia Ruskin University
Dr John Wells	Cancer Research UK Cambridge Institute

Members or substitutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board in attendance:

Councillor Ian Bates	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Lewis Herbert	Cambridge City Council

Officers/advisors:

Rachel Stopard	Greater Cambridge Partnership
Graham Hughes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Niamh Matthews	Greater Cambridge Partnership
Wilma Wilkie	South Cambridgeshire District Council

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 19th July were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairperson, subject to correcting two typographical errors and on page 17 of the agenda pack, deleting the second and third paragraph of the second bullet point, to be replaced with 'It would be more prudent to evaluate busses using grid average Green House Gas emissions'.

4. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Three public questions had been submitted, two of which were taken at the meeting under agenda item six. The third question did not relate to an item on the agenda and would be resubmitted to the November meeting.

5. PETITIONS

No petitions were received.

6. CAMBOURNE TO CAMBRIDGE BETTER BUS JOURNEYS SCHEME - APPROACH TO PUBLIC CONSULTATION INFORMING FULL OUTLINE BUSINESS CASE DEVELOPMENT

The Joint Assembly considered a report to be presented to the next Executive Board meeting, which provided an update on further assessment work carried out on the proposed Cambourne to Cambridge Better Bus Journey Scheme and proposed an approach to the next stage of public consultation.

Helen Bradbury, Chairperson of the Local Liaison Forum (LLF) attended the meeting and presented feedback on the Forum's views on the proposals. As part of her presentation, Ms Bradbury summarised the following recommendations agreed at the LLF meeting on 11th September 2017:

- The LLF welcomed the removal of Crome Lea as a potential site for a new park and ride, but was concerned that another site on Madingley Hill had been included in the shortlist. The LLF did not consider Madingley Hill as a suitable location because of poor accessibility, poor connectivity, the unacceptably high environmental damage caused by a site there and the fact that it was located after congestion began, so would worsen, not alleviate local traffic problems. The LLF therefore recommended that all options for a park and ride site on Madingley Hill in the vicinity of the Madingley Mulch roundabout be dropped.
- The LLF rejected claims made at the Executive Board meeting on 26th July 2017 that it was seeking to block all work. It was concerned that projects were being set up in a sequence that was not cumulative, which could be contradictory and could result in excessive sums of money being allocated to schemes that may have a short operative duration. The LLF proposed that the Executive Board should differentiate at the time of its approval between short term and long term measures.
- The LLF did not consider that option 6 had been fairly presented in the documentation to date and asked that before the next public consultation the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) instruct officers to work with the LLF to develop option 6 so that the best on-road alternative was presented to the public.

- The LLF did not agree with the scoring of the Enhanced Multi Criteria Assessment Framework (MCAF) which it regarded as illogical and biased in favour of option 3a. It asked the GCP to instruct officers to work with the LLF Technical Group over the next six months to prepare the final business case documentation for the three options under consideration and to conduct the next public consultation.
- The LLF sought urgent clarification of the logic of choosing Grange Road on the western edge of the City as an end point for the proposed bus route and a detailed explanation of how busses would journey between the key City centre locations of Bridge Street and Drummer Street bus station.
- The LLF remained concerned that the environmental impact of a park and ride site on Madingley Hill and the off-line 3a busway were being significantly underplayed in the documentation and asked that these assessments were re-analysed, with the possible future impacts of future proofing considered.
- The LLF asked that the timing of the consultation and associated documentation should be thought about very carefully. It believed that consultation should not be undertaken until key pieces of evidence/data were available, namely the outcome of the rapid mass transit option appraisal; a full development of the alternative community proposal (option 6); and a full analysis and description of the proposed route of the bus between Grange Road and the City Centre. It was also suggested that the LLF be included in agreeing the content and design of questions to be asked in the next round of consultations.

At this stage in the proceedings the Chairperson invited members of the public to ask questions relating to this item, which had been submitted in line with the provisions of Standing Orders. He explained that a response to the questions would be covered in the officer presentation on the report. Details of the questions and a summary of the answers given are set out in Appendix A to the minutes.

The Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environmental Services in introducing the item drew attention to the purpose of the report and stressed that the Executive Board was not being asked to approve any particular scheme. This project had been one of the first proposed as part of the original City Deal process and had undergone a significant amount of development over the past couple of years. While the Executive Director noted comments about engagement made by the LLF, he highlighted that there had been extensive engagement throughout the process as plans had been developed. He also drew attention to recent surveys of existing Busway users and potential users of the scheme along the A428 corridor.

It was noted that further analysis of the proposed routes, using an extended version of the MCAF presented to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in July 2017, suggested that although Option 1 [a sectional on road east bound bus lane running from Madingley Mulch to Lady Margaret Road within the existing highway] continued to perform well as a lower cost on road comparator, the potential to achieve 2-way bus priority along the existing highway via option 6 [a tidal, bi-directional bus lane running from Madingley Mulch to High Cross] should also be considered. It was therefore proposed that options 1 and 6 should be taken forward for further public consultation along with a number of specific route alignments (SRAs) identified as part of option 3a. These SRAs did not represent final detailed design proposals, as that would only be appropriate as part of the next stage of work and would require significant additional on site surveys. The proposals which would form the basis of the public consultation were set out in appendix 4 to the report.

The Executive Director explained the key conclusions from the stage 2 park and ride study which had looked in detail at the five sites shortlisted by the Executive Board at its July meeting. This had concluded that the two sites that merited further consideration were Scotland Farm and The Waterworks.

With reference to the proposed consultation process, the Joint Assembly noted that subject to further development of the full outline business case, a two stage public consultation strategy was proposed. This would involve an initial stage, programmed for November 2017, focused on phase one of the scheme; from Madingley Mulch to Long Road. This was the section of the route with the most significant known strategic issues, given current and projected levels of congestion. It was proposed that more analysis of the full outline business case for the entire corridor take place and that subject to this analysis, a further round of public consultation on alignments west of Long Road take place in the autumn of 2018. This would be more fully informed by emerging strategic considerations which impacted on the phase 2 element of the scheme, including the proposed alignment of the phase 1 scheme.

The Joint Assembly was invited to consider and comment on the recommendations to be presented to the Executive Board. The main points of discussion are summarised below:

- Councillor Grenville Chamberlain was of the view that modal shift would only be achieved if public transport was rapid, reliable and served destinations that people wished to go to. He was concerned that the site at Madingley Hill did not have direct access to the A428 and consequently any vehicles wishing to go from there towards the north or east of Cambridge would have to go via the City centre. He commented that the Madingley Hill site was not suitable, as delays along Madingley Road into Cambridge meant people would have little incentive to use park and ride. He also suggested that the site was not future proofed as it was not compatible with the aim of creating a travel corridor of rapid transport around Cambridge. Councillor Chamberlain believed that the GCP should look to provide access to a park and ride site which people could drive to easily. He suggested that if people were taken off the road further back at Scotland Farm there was a much greater chance of them using park and ride.
- Councillor Bridget Smith expressed concern about the quality of the paper, which she felt was poorly written and contained illegible maps. She commented on the 49 separate background reports which had been issued to the LLF a week before its meeting. It was unacceptable to expect the LLF to deal with that amount of reading in such a short timescale. With reference to the proposals, Councillor Smith was concerned that having concluded that Crome Lea was unsuitable, she found it hard to understand why the Waterworks Site was being recommended. This site was only two fields away from Crome Lea and in her opinion was equally unsuitable. In response the Executive Director confirmed that the Waterworks Site had been included on the basis of the outcome of a technical sifting process based on its assessment against the agreed criteria.
- Councillor Smith also commented on the importance of journey times and asked for clarification of what was defined as the City centre. She pointed out that there was a significant difference between busses dropping passengers at Silver Street or John Lewis. She also reported that in response to a question at the LLF, Atkins had confirmed that there were no engineering reasons why option 6 could not be developed in its entirety and asked officers to comment on this. In response the Executive Director stated that at this stage the focus was on dealing with the infrastructure but it was vitally important as this process progressed that it was clear

about what happened east of Grange Road. A considerable amount of work was going on as part of the City Centre Access Study to look at bus movements generally and that would play a big part in informing that process. No doubt it would identify that there were specific infrastructure measures required to make this work but that would come from further work. He accepted the need for options to be joined up but work was not yet at that stage. However he imagined it would be necessary for busses to turn left and right at Grange Road but it would be essential to demonstrate that it was possible for them to do that. With reference to the comment made by Atkins, the Executive Director confirmed that this was correct but pointed out that there was a difference in what could be engineered; because in reality you could engineer most things, and what the impact of the engineering would be.

- Councillor John Williams sought clarification of the estimated journey times set out in paragraph 19 of the report. He also asked why journey frequency had not been included in the transport criteria used to assess the shortlisted options. In doing so he highlighted the importance of service frequency and suggested that he was not convinced that the proposals would result in a frequent bus service that was sufficient to persuade people to leave their cars. The Executive Director confirmed that the tables set out in paragraph 19 provided a comparison of the estimated journey times. The Scotland Farm journey times were slightly longer as there was a greater diversion to the site. With reference to frequency, he agreed that service frequency was key but it was difficult to incorporate this into the assessment process as it depended on the actual services that the bus companies ultimately agreed to run. From a purely objective point of view it was easier to model how long a particular vehicle would take to get from A to B. However, if the right route was selected and it generated sufficient passenger numbers then a high frequency service would be forthcoming.
- Councillor Williams drew attention paragraph 13 of the Western Orbital report which referred to a potential site for a new park and ride interchange hub. He was disappointed that the report looked at the A428 proposals in isolation and did not take account of the needs of people travelling to the Biomedical Campus and the Science Park, as well as those travelling into the City centre. He suggested that the options being considered would do little to help those people travelling to work outside the City centre and stressed the need for a high frequency orbital service which interchanged with one of the busway options from Camborne to Cambridge. In response the Executive Director explained that while it was not possible to provide an everywhere to anywhere service, there would be key route connections to be made. Where demand existed he was confident that bus operators would link those routes.
- Andy Williams recognised this was an important transport corridor and drew attention to figures confirming that around 10% of those travelling to the Biomedical Campus used the A428 corridor, a figure that would grow as planned development around the City progressed. This confirmed the need for another park and ride site as soon as possible. He supported Councillor Williams' comments about the need for this to link to key work sites and in the longer term ensure links with the western orbital route and the M11. In response the Executive Director explained that at this point in time there were only potential alignments, not clear routes but agreed it was essential to consider possible links. Connecting thousands of people with thousands of jobs was the rationale behind the whole scheme and this would need to be made clear in subsequent iterations of these proposals.
- Andy Williams also stressed the need for a reliable service and commented that the report did not include a definition of reliability, which had formed part of other schemes such as Milton Road. Mr Williams suggested that it was important to be clear about

this in the consultation. He also commented that not everyone would be familiar with what was meant by reference to Cambourne to Grange Road and suggested that people were more likely to engage in the consultation if it referred to journey times to places they wanted to travel to, such as John Lewis or Addenbrookes.

- Claire Ruskin commented that it was evident from the questions being asked that a compelling case for change was not being made, with the exception of those people who had to sit in the traffic jams each day. It was clear that there was huge congestion on this road and staff had to travel to work extremely early to get to their desk at a sensible time. Ms Ruskin commented that it was clear that something needed to be done in the short term until such time as more radical solutions, such as tunneling, could be developed. She agreed that it was desirable to provide a big park and ride site further out as soon as possible, using busses to bring people in from rural villages and taking them to the places they needed to get to. It was important to base a case on data which evidenced the need for change and clarify the level of improvement it was expected to achieve as a result of the proposed options and this should be made clear as part of the planned consultation.
- Councillor Tim Bick asked for clarification of the impact of the option 1 proposals on existing and future provision for cyclists and pedestrians along Madingley Road. In response the Executive Director confirmed that bearing in mind the current narrowness of Madingley Road there would be an impact on existing provision. It would be possible to engineer an option that maintained or enhanced existing provision but this would come at a price and an impact on the scheme.
- Councillor Bick confirmed that he accepted the underlying strategic case for a fast and efficient transport corridor to the west of Cambridge and highlighted the importance of acknowledging that strategic need. There were large numbers of people living there and working in Cambridge now and there would in future be vastly more given planned developments. He confirmed that at this point in time he regarded an off road solution as the one to beat; using buses, based on the existing Busway, or one of the other methods of transport being considered as part of the wider strategic study. With reference to the proposed park and ride sites, Councillor Bick welcomed removal of Crome Lea from the shortlist and pointed out that the suitability of the remaining sites would be tested through the consultation process. He also welcomed the fact that there was a clear aim to minimise the impact of the proposals on West Fields. Councillor Bick echoed comments made by others about the importance of integrating this proposal with other schemes, in particular plans to split travellers to the north and the south as they crossed the M11. He accepted that it was not practical to bring all related schemes to the table in the same state of preparedness. However, he explained that before he was willing to support the A428 proposals as absolutely the right thing to do, he would need to see at least how a fully integrated scheme including connections to the north and the south was going to be achieved. With reference to the public consultation exercise, Councillor Bick commented that he was genuinely interested in hearing people's views on the proposed options and welcomed the possibility of having his preconceptions challenged. He hoped that others shared this view; otherwise there was no point in having any form of consultation.
- In response to a question from Councillor Noel Kavanagh, the Executive Director confirmed that the timescale for securing the statutory approvals needed could take between 12 and 36 months. He explained that the reason for the wide range related to the fact that the exact process would depend on the nature of the final proposals. A straightforward planning application would take significantly less time than a Transport Works Act Order.

- Helen Valentine referred to the results of the telephone survey set out in paragraph 27 of the report which expressed support for the notion of doing something along this corridor and contrasted this with the reservations being expressed by the LLF. She asked if those surveyed were people living further out who would not be as directly impacted as those living in the vicinity of the development. In response it was noted that the survey sample had been drawn from residents who lived along the A428 corridor, specifically Cambourne, Hardwick, Highfields, Caldecote, St Neots, Coton, Dry Drayton and Madingley.

The Joint Assembly considered the officer recommendations being presented to the Executive Board, taking into account comments from the LLF and public questions.

Councillor Bridget Smith proposed the following amendment which was duly seconded by Councillor Grenville Chamberlain:

Add to recommendation 2a:

‘subject to:

1. Further work with the LLF to produce an optimal on road solution;
2. Detail regarding routes and journeys to the key employment sites; and
3. Further detail on the connection to the M11’.

Responding to the proposed amendment, the Interim Chief Executive explained that there was now time available to prepare consultation materials and, subject to the Board approving the recommendations, this would take account of the Assembly’s comments on being really clear about what this scheme would bring in terms of links to the employment sites and links to other routes. With reference to further work with the LLF she confirmed that there was a continued commitment to work with the LLF but was concerned that this very precise wording could impact on the consultation timetable.

Councillor Smith thanked the Interim Chief Executive for her comments and in response agreed to amend the wording to read as follows:

Add to the end of recommendation 2a:

‘subject to a further meeting with the LLF Technical Group to further refine option 6 and the consultation including further detail on the connectivity to key employment sites and on the connection to the M11; subject to work with Highways England’.

The amendment in its revised form was seconded by Councillor Grenville Chamberlain and on being put to the vote was agreed unanimously.

The Joint Assembly agreed unanimously to **RECOMMEND** that the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board:

- a) Agree, based on the considerations in the report, to undertake further public consultation on the Park and Ride options and route alignments identified in Appendix 4 for the Cambourne to Cambridge Better Bus Journey scheme as part of the ongoing development of the Full Outline Business Case, *subject to a further meeting with the LLF Technical Group to further refine option 6; and the consultation including further detail on the connectivity to key employment sites and on the connection to the M11 subject to work with Highways England; and*

- b) Agree the timetable in the report.

Changes to the officer recommendations are shown in italic text.

7. WESTERN ORBITAL

The Joint Assembly considered a report to be presented to the next Executive Board meeting which provided information on further assessment of the Western Orbital project undertaken since December 2016. It was noted that this project had a number of specific work streams including park and ride expansion and engagement with Highways England (HE) on the strategy for the M11 corridor to improve access to key growth sites and bus priority.

Helen Bradbury, Chairperson of the LLF attended the meeting and presented feedback on the Forum's views on the proposals. Ms Bradbury expressed concern about the time available for the LLF to consider proposals in advance of GCP meetings and drew attention to the fact that over half its members represented Parish Councils and had to consult their members in advance of LLF meetings. On the specific proposals she reported that she had two Western Orbital meetings to report back on. The first on 21st June 2017 had resolved that:

Park and Ride should be sited before congestion begins and as a general principal new transport infrastructure should not be allowed to urbanise villages surrounding the City or damage the City's Green Belt. The LLF requested that the City Deal:

- Investigate sites south of Harston.
- Prioritise rail.
- Consider a heavy rail park and ride at Foxton.

The second meeting took place on 11th September 2017 and looked specifically at the proposals being considered today about the expansion of the current park and ride site. On behalf of Trumpington Residents Association the LLF asked:

- That a full risk assessment of the proposed expansion be undertaken recognising it was located in a residential area and was located next to a school.
- That the expansion include additional landscaping and a wooded screening area between the park and ride site and the primary school right next to it.
- What evidence supported the statement that the existing road network could cope with yet more demand as a result of this expansion.

With reference to the upgrading of the M11 to a Smart motorway, the LLF asked for more information on what this would entail; what the safety implications were; and how this would be accommodated by the County.

The Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environmental Services in introducing the report drew attention to the fact this was an update report. He explained that a range of issues were being discussed with HE and reassured the Joint Assembly that this was very much being linked to associated proposals for the A428 and Maddingley Road. Work included Girton Interchange, its relationship to the current A14 scheme and also links to a potential expressway scheme. There were no absolute conclusions to those discussions yet, but officers were challenging HE to identify things that could be done sooner rather than later. Work on Junction 11 was continuing with the aim of getting a direct route into the park and ride site and Design Teams were working to prepare detailed proposal for

this. In addition it was planned to put forward a submission as part of the Road Investment Strategy consultation to evidence why a Smart motorway conversion of at least junctions 10 to 14 was considered essential.

With reference to the planned expansion of the Trumpington park and ride site, the Executive Director explained that a simple modelling exercise had taken place to identify what potential demand could be under a series of scenarios. This had given an estimate of projected increased park and ride demand at Junction 11, which ranged from 400 to 850 depending on the scenario. It was clear that additional spaces were required and a number of options for expansion had been prepared based on ground level expansion of the existing site and/or new infrastructure on the site, either above or below ground. At this stage it was proposed to proceed with ground level expansion and it was estimated that an additional 299 spaces could be provided. This would accommodate all of the expected additional demand up to 2022. The cost would be just over £1.5m. It was noted that additional work was also planned to provide 5 extra full coach bays or 10 minibuss bays for schools and long distance tourist coaches. The indicative cost of this improvement was £325,000.

With reference to comments made by the LLF, the Executive Director confirmed that a full risk assessment would take place. Regarding comments about planting and landscaping, he explained that the scheme was based on turning some of the landscaped areas into additional surfaced car park. However plans would be subject to planning permission which would likely include conditions on providing appropriate landscaping. With reference to priority junctions, the Executive Director explained that the City Centre Access Project was looking at managing how traffic moved around the City and there was also a piece of work looking at how more modern traffic signal systems could be used across the whole of the City.

The Joint Assembly was invited to consider and comment on the recommendations to be presented to the Executive Board. The main points of discussion are summarised below:

- Councillor Tim Bick asked who would consider the planning application for the expansion of the park and ride site and in response the Executive Director explained that there was no hard and fast rule, but such applications would normally be considered by the County Council's Development Control Committee. Councillor Bick indicated that landscaping and screening were likely to be strongly advocated by Ward Councillors and local residents.
- Councillor Bick asked for clarification of the term 'Smart' motorway and emphasised the need to be clear what the GCP was expecting to get out of this proposal. He understood this would involve using the hard shoulder as a third lane and asked if this was the case, how this met identified need. In response the Executive Director explained that the Smart motorway approach involved making better use of information to manage traffic and could also include using the hard shoulder as an additional lane. The discussions with HE were based on the assumption that proposals would involve the use of the hard shoulder. It was acknowledged that just doing this would not resolve the problems and discussions with HE would also include the need for improved junctions; in particular 11, 12 and 13.
- In response to a question from Councillor John Williams the Executive Director explained that the cost of additional landscaping was not included in the costs, which at this stage were broad estimates. The final scheme would be costed in detail and would include landscaping along with other work.

- Councillor Noel Kavanagh welcomed the expansion of coach parking and asked whether there were any plans to expand the existing park and cycle facilities. The Executive Director acknowledged park and cycle was a popular facility, but explained that there was already a significant amount of provision on site, but if considered necessary this could be expanded.
- Councillor Dave Baigent asked whether consideration had been given to the potential knock on effect of any expansion to residents' parking schemes in the City. The loss of on street parking in the City could lead to an increased demand for park and ride. In response the Executive Director confirmed that there could be a significant knock on effect if residents parking schemes were introduced across the City. It was unlikely that this would happen in the near future as currently only 7 or 8 zones were under consideration.
- Andy Williams welcomed the proposals. He understood residents' concerns and asked for these to be taken into account in progressing the proposals. In particular he was concerned about safety on this very busy site and asked for this to be given careful consideration. He expressed support for the provision of additional park and ride sites to serve traffic coming into Cambridge on the M11 and asked for an assurance that development of the Trumpington park and ride site would not delay discussions about additional park and ride provision, because Trumpington would not be enough to meet increased demand. In response the Executive Director confirmed that what was being proposed was a short term measure to get some additional spaces on the site fairly quickly. Work on additional park and ride provision in the longer term would not be delayed.
- Councillor Bridget Smith referred to the LLF's recommendation that consideration be given to providing a rail focused park and ride site at Foxton and recalled that this had been agreed in principle some time ago. She drew attention to concern about how to justify spending £1.5m on interventions at this stage if the longer term plan was to spend a significant amount of money on a consolidated site. In response the Executive Director repeated his comments about the need for a short term solution pending the development of additional park and ride provision, which would take at least three years to put in place. He explained that notwithstanding the development of additional park and ride sites, the Trumpington site would remain on the existing site for some time as there was a covenant on the site to ensure long term access to the John Lewis collection facility.
- Councillor Smith also asked about the coach drop off and referred to an article in a newspaper about an authority that had banned cars dropping off at schools. She appreciated this was a radical step, but wondered if encouraging parents to use a safe high quality park and ride arrangement would potentially have a dramatic impact on the number of cars travelling into schools in Cambridge. Councillor Smith also referred to concerns about the potential impact of traffic on the A10 and asked for and received an assurance that officers would be modelling that. She also echoed Councillor Kavanagh's comments about using this as an opportunity to optimise park and cycle provision.
- Councillor Tim Wotherspoon reported that the new primary school at Cambridge North West was adopting a similar approach banning the use of cars for school drop off. The Executive Director explained that there were ways of controlling of school drop off, but emphasised this was potentially a highly contentious issue. If this were to be proposed elsewhere it would need to be considered and consulted on very carefully.

The Joint Assembly considered the officer recommendations being presented to the Executive Board, taking into account comments from the LLF and agreed unanimously to **RECOMMEND** that the Executive Board:

- a) Note the progress to date;
- b) Delegate to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Chairperson a response to Highways England (HE) supporting:
 - the inclusion of an M11 Smart Motorway upgrade within the next Highways England Route Investment Strategy whilst ensuring that local impacts are fully assessed through the business case development process; and
 - the upgrade of the functionality and the 'all movement' accessibility of the Girton Interchange subject to full impact assessment;
- c) Agree to increase the number of spaces at the Trumpington Park and Ride site subject to necessary planning permissions being obtained;
- d) Agree to undertake a more detailed business case analysis as set out in the report in relation to medium term Park and Ride expansion and Park and Cycle options and associated junction improvements; and
- e) Agree the next steps/ timetable detailed in the report.

8. DEVELOPING A TEN YEAR (2020-30) FUTURE INVESTMENT STRATEGY

The Joint Assembly considered a report to be presented to the next Executive Board meeting, which outlined a proposed process for developing a ten year Future Investment Strategy for the GCP.

The Interim Chief Executive in introducing the report drew attention to the need for the GCP to focus its ambition on its long term vision for economic growth and to align its resources accordingly. This would build on progress made to date, but would also articulate a longer term view of how it was planned to prioritise the use of available funding. She outlined plans to hold a 'Big Conversation' with stakeholders, residents and businesses to assist in developing proposals for investment over the longer term.

The Joint Assembly was invited to consider and comment on the recommendations to be presented to the Executive Board. The main points of discussion are summarised below:

- Sir Michael Marshall supported the proposals and asked how Joint Assembly members could help with the planned Big Conversation. In response the Interim Director explained that, subject to the Executive Board's decision next week, there would be a wide range of events and Joint Assembly members were welcome to participate in as many as they were able to.
- Councillor Bridget Smith reported that she had asked for information on how successful the GCP had been in attracting matched funding and suggested that it might have been useful to have had that information to inform this discussion. In response, it was confirmed that a response to Councillor Smith's question was being prepared. In addition this information would be covered as part of the budget report to be presented to the November meeting.

- Claire Ruskin commented that she had been asked by LEP colleagues to point out that in paragraph 12 of the report there was no mention of the Strategic Economic Plan and the Strategic Economic Evidence Base. She suggested that it may be appropriate to include reference to these. With reference to the planned Big Conversation, Ms Ruskin was supportive of this, but highlighted the importance of making sure that the GCP showed some leadership in the process rather than just asking a range of open ended questions.
- Councillor Tim Bick supported Claire Ruskin's comments about the need for leadership and focus in the proposed Big Conversation. He commented the need to be clear what priorities were being discussed and asked for confirmation that these were the various interventions that had been discussed in the task and finish groups. In response the Interim Chief Executive confirmed that that was the case. She commented that the intention was to report back to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board on the outcome of these conversations so it would be important to ensure the discussions were structured accordingly.
- Andy Williams supported the proposals but emphasised the need to use individuals who were experienced in engaging with the public to ensure the conversations were meaningful.

The Joint Assembly considered the officer recommendations and agreed unanimously to **RECOMMEND** that the Executive Board:

- a) Develop a 10 year Future Investment Strategy (FIS) and the process set out in paragraphs 11-15 of the report for agreeing priorities; and
- b) Undertake a significant engagement exercise (called Our Big Conversation) in order that the views of stakeholders, residents and businesses can be included in the development of the FIS.

9. SKILLS - DEVELOPING THE GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP AMBITION

The Joint Assembly considered a report to be presented to the next Executive Board meeting, which set out progress with the skills work stream and recommended next steps.

The Strategic Programme and Commissioning Manager, in introducing the report confirmed that the skills work stream had so far secured good progress across its involvement in a number of activities and current projects had been delivered on time and within budget. However, the work stream had not yet been able to demonstrate a direct and fully evidenced link between the work agreed to date and the 420 apprenticeship target agreed as part of the City Deal Agreement. A number of proposals were being recommended to address this issue, including setting up a GCP apprenticeship matching/brokerage service with a focus on STEM based apprenticeships.

The Joint Assembly was invited to consider and comment on the recommendations to be presented to the Executive Board. The main points of discussion are summarised below:

- Councillor Bridget Smith expressed concern about the proposals, which she saw as the GCP's exit strategy from direct involvement in skills work. While she accepted that the LEP and the Combined Authority had significant roles in this area, she stressed the fact that the GCP was the only body looking specifically at provision in South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City and if the GCP pulled out there was no

guarantee that anyone else would fill the void. Councillor Smith was also concerned that the proposed solution had not yet been discussed by the newly formed Skills Working Group and was of the opinion that the report should be withdrawn until such time as the Group had been afforded an opportunity to consider it. That aside, Councillor Smith commented that she had very serious concerns about what the paper was proposing and suggested that the idea of a brokerage scheme was being proposed without any evidence to suggest it would address the problem or was what people wanted. She was surprised that it was planned to only promote STEM apprenticeships when previously it had been agreed to promote construction.

- Helen Valentine was also skeptical that the proposals were the right solution as she was not at all sure that the GCP had a valid role to play in skills. She was anxious that there would not be a good return on money spent on this proposal. She accepted skills was part of the original bid but saw no problem in admitting after stage one that as a result of work to date the GCP was not best placed to deal with skills matters.
- Councillor John Williams commented that he disagreed with the proposed focus on STEM and reiterated the need to focus on construction. There was a desperate need to train up a local workforce to undertake this type of work.
- Councillor Grenville Chamberlain supported Councillor Smith's suggestion that the Skills Working Group be asked to look at this in more detail and report back. Mark Robertson also spoke in support of this.
- Councillor Tim Wotherspoon did not see the benefit of deferral and pointed out that the recommendations did not refer specifically to an exit strategy. He suggested most of Councillor Smith's concerns could be addressed by expanding the proposed brokerage service to include construction. He drew attention to the need for some urgency given the requirement to meet the apprenticeship target agreed with Government as part of the original City Deal agreement.
- Claire Ruskin commented that she had been involved in earlier discussions on this and had been told that it was expected to achieve the target; although she acknowledged it had been some time since the Skills Group had met and circumstances may have changed. Ms Ruskin commented that the 420 target was a ridiculously small number and suggested that a more ambitious target should be set. She felt there was a need to look at the total picture, see which links were broken and act accordingly. The paper did not include any evidence to suggest what was being proposed was the right solution.
- Councillor Tim Bick commented that he had also been involved in earlier work on skills and had been disappointed at the way people had tried to focus on different aspects of the skills agenda. He was of the view that GCP should be focusing on making a difference in the broad skills market in the Greater Cambridge area. There had been poor consistency in views from the Executive Board on this subject and from support officers. He accepted that a brokerage service had a role to play but suggested that this was grossly oversold in the paper. While this helped allocate people to an identified role, but it did not solve the problem of supply not equaling demand. He agreed that there was some merit in this being looked at by the new Working Group.

In response to the comments made the Strategic Programme and Commissioning Manager emphasised that the proposals did not represent a withdrawal from skills work. Instead it was hoped this would facilitate better working with the LEP and Combined Authority and make sure that the work being done by the GCP helped them in the longer

term. It was anticipated that the proposed brokerage service would compliment not replicate existing services provided by others. The Interim Chief Executive confirmed that as part of developing this proposal officers had met with Cambridge Regional College and it had been agreed that the focus would be on providing additionality to what was currently provided. She added that the discussion demonstrated that there was a huge amount of complexity in the delivery of the skills system and one of the reasons it was being suggested that the GCP step back from it within the overarching strategy was there was a risk of it adding to that complexity. At the same time there was serious concern that there were young people missing out on opportunities that the GCP could afford to assist with for the next 18-24 months whilst that wider strategy was considered.

Councillor Bridget Smith proposed an alternative recommendation which was seconded by Councillor Grenville Chamberlain. On being put to the vote it was agreed by 7 votes to 6 that the Joint Assembly **RECOMMEND** that the Executive Board:

Agree to withdraw the report and defer consideration of this item so it can be discussed the Skills Working Group, with the outcome of this being reported back to the next meeting of the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in November.

10. GCP QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

The Joint Assembly considered a report to be presented to the next Executive Board meeting, which detailed progress across the GCP programme since the last report presented in July 2017. The report covered the following:

- Financial Monitoring.
- Greenways and Rural Travel Hubs.
- The GCP Strategic Risk Register.
- Forward Plan of Executive Board Decisions.

The Strategic Programme and Commissioning Manager in introducing the report drew attention to the fact that in response to questions asked at the last meeting, the report now contained information on where affordable homes were being built and would in future include reference to national trends on apprenticeships.

The Joint Assembly considered the officer recommendations and agreed unanimously to **RECOMMEND** that the Executive Board:

- a) Note the quarterly progress report and its appendices;
- b) Agree to redefine the target completion date for Chisholm Trail cycle links Phase 2, to reflect experience of the planning process for Phase 1 [see para. 17 of the report]; and
- c) Endorse the scope and key objectives of the Greenways and Rural Travel Hubs schemes [see Appendix 2 of the report].

11. DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The Joint Assembly noted arrangements for future meetings:

- Thursday 2nd November 2017, Council Chamber, South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne.
- Thursday 18th January 2018, Kreis Viersen Room, Shire Hall, Cambridge.

- Wednesday 28th February 2018, Council Chamber, South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne.
- Thursday 14th June 2018 *.
- Thursday 20th September 2018 *.
- Thursday 15th November 2018 *.

All meetings to commence at 2.00 p.m.

* Venue to be confirmed

**The Meeting ended
at 5.05 p.m.**

APPENDIX A

GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP JOINT ASSEMBLY – 13th SEPTEMBER 2017
PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND OFFICER RESPONSES

Agenda Item 6: Cambourne to Cambridge Better Bus Journeys Scheme

6a	<p>Question from Mal Schofield</p> <p>The A 428 corridor daily car commuters were +/- 5000 in 2011*. Of these, just 15%, 750 drivers would benefit from an alternative faster, reliable, frequent service to work in Cambridge West and the immediate city centre. All other commuters would be obliged to journey onwards e.g. to the Science Park. The propensity to take a second bus etc. needs to be understood. The assumption would be something like <i>'onward commuting to work, two or more journeys, then depends upon the expectation of where predictable delays e.g. bus dwell time, represent less than 10% of the total journey time'</i>.</p> <p>The UCL DataShine** analysis shows, for the A428 driver, 1 in 4 (25%) commuting to Cambridge NE (A14); the same 1 in 4 (25%) to the SE (M11;A505?), the dominant commute 1 in 3 (35%) to the south/west (M11/A1304). The potential 750 drivers will subdivide in both demographic and behavioural terms. Some could be persuaded to car share, others will treat the car as a daily essential - the enabler of reduced time overall including school runs, visits en route and shopping essentials.</p> <p>Using the research data above - 37% of 750 = 288 drivers. The peak time driver commuter potential for non stop services from Cambourne to Cambridge.</p> <p>In the fuller context this switch represents 14% of daily car commuters into the city (200,000 in 2015). The real issue therefore remains the high cost: benefit relationship if the primary "solution" to car commuter reduction is to be travel by bus + off road busways.</p> <p>Question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How many more dedicated busways are anticipated? For just a 1% modal shift, it appears, 6 + more busways will be needed/ <p>*Source: 2011 Census Travel to Work **Source: http://commute.datashine.org.uk/#mode=cardriving&direction</p>
	<p>Response</p> <p>The Executive Director confirmed he had looked at the analysis any was well aware of the datasets, but did not feel it relevant to get into the rights or wrongs of the data or different interpretations of it. He understood the essence of the question was the suggestion that the current strategy was not going to deliver what it was aimed to deliver; i.e. achieving modal shift. In response to that he drew attention to the fact that this item was about one particular corridor, which is the route along the A428, but the GCP has a whole series of plans right across and around the city. Each of the key radial routes into the city is or will be over a period of time the subject of detailed proposals. Each of those will receive appropriate consideration and there will be different solutions for different routes. For example there is a lot of discussion about Milton Road, which is essentially an on road solution because that's what the space allows. For the A480 the options are designed to accommodate on and off road solutions.</p> <p>Any transport system will be a linear system and in linear systems one is never going to create a route that is going to go to everywhere to everywhere direct. Most transport systems require some sort of change of mode or interchange. The critical thing is how you design those interchanges and how you make the reliability and journey times attractive. While people preferred to avoid interchanging, but most systems into medium or large cities required some form of interchange.</p> <p>In summary, the Executive Director explained that while he did not dispute the numbers or the analysis of them, he did not agree with the main proposition that the proposals in the scheme would not result in significant shift.</p>

6b	Question from Dr Marilyn Treacy
	<p>As evidenced by the recent protest march and Cambridge Deserves Better meeting, which was standing room only, residents from all across Cambridge do not feel that their views regarding GCP schemes are being heard. The GCP is about to embark on another round of consultation regarding the Cambourne to Cambridge busway scheme. After the previous round of deeply flawed public consultation for preferred options public opinion counted for only 4% in the subsequent scoring. Residents were left feeling incredulous and let down by the process .</p> <p>Can the GCP please re-assure residents that the planned public consultation will be fair and transparent and would you please inform me at this stage how public opinion will be scored i.e. exactly what % will be allocated to the public opinion in the scoring for the choice of the preferred option for the full outline business case development?</p>
	<p>Response</p> <p>With reference to transparency, the national test of fairness of public consultation is known as the Gunning Principles and that will be used to test the proposed consultation process. These principles cover how and when to consult; the method by which you inform people and ensure that they can understand what they are being asked; making sure people can respond; allowing sufficient time to respond; and making sure that that the outcome is taken into account when reaching any decisions made.</p> <p>The GCP was currently working very closely with the Consultation Institute, a national not for profit body that promotes best practice in engagement and consultation. They would act as critical friend during this particular consultation process and had already been involved in terms of giving guidance on the process and challenging the materials and approach to be taken. In terms of that approach, the process and materials would be tested beforehand with the LLF and with other groups, because clearly there was a need to ensure that people could understand and respond in a fair way.</p> <p>In summary, it was planned to conform to the Gunning Principles and for quality assurance work would be done with the Consultation institute and all materials would be tested before the consultation process began. The consultation process itself would be as full as possible using a wide range of methods. The outcome would be reported back in due course.</p> <p>With reference to weighting it is important to stress that it is planned to seek a range of comments on a wide range of proposals and what was being proposed was not a referendum. People were not being asked if they liked one thing and not another. The important point to make is that generally speaking only 1-2% of the population responded to a consultation and it was therefore difficult to present this as truly representative of the community or group that may be impacted by a particular scheme. It was not proposed to apply weighting to the public consultation; it was for the decision makers to take account of the outcome when reaching their decision.</p>

Question Deferred to the November Meeting

6a	Question from Patrick von Heimendahl
	<p>Last year the protest against the City Deal concentrated around the road closures. These closures would have hit many small businesses which required vehicle access. Many businesses are struggling to keep afloat for various reasons. One of them being access. Old established independent businesses contribute the flair and charm of living in our city. Open the paper and you read that small independent businesses in our City are facing a tough time. Since last year, amongst others, we have seen the loss of 'The Cambridge Toy Shop', 'Clowns' and now 'Hobbs' after 86 years.</p> <p>It is without doubt that the road closures the City Deal proposed would have been another nail in the coffin of small independent businesses and would have lead to an avalanche of further closures. We do not want this to happen!</p> <p>In a meeting with the Interim Transport Director of GCP at the End of March it was mentioned that the City Access policy is to plan to make cross city access impossible. The traffic survey in June, few doubt, will have looked for and found evidence to support such a policy. You all heard of the 'petal scheme' a disastrous plan born out of the same unimaginative mindset as the road closures. These</p>

	<p>policies will lead to rat running and a dissection of our city. Cambridge has an unusually transient and mobile population but for the core residents and businesses the city is our neighbourhood. These policies only differ marginally from the PCCP and businesses and residents will pay hugely for such a negative policy.</p>
--	---

	<p>By abandoning the road closure last year the Assembly and the Executive Board of the City Deal showed wisdom. The suggested new policy is so similar that by the same wisdom the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly surely must refrain from considering such traffic measures again. Could the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly please confirm that?</p>
--	--