



**GREATER  
CAMBRIDGE  
PARTNERSHIP**

Growing and sharing prosperity

Delivering our City Deal

## **GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE BOARD**

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board held on  
Wednesday, 20 September 2017 at 4.00 p.m.

### **Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board:**

Cllr Francis Burkitt (Chairperson)	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Lewis Herbert (Vice Chairperson)	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Ian Bates	Cambridgeshire County Council
Mark Reeve	Local Enterprise Partnership

### **Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly in Attendance:**

Councillor Kevin Price (Chairperson)	Cambridge City Council
--------------------------------------	------------------------

### **Officers/advisors:**

Rachel Stopard	Interim Chief Executive, Greater Cambridge Partnership
Graham Hughes	Executive Director, Cambridgeshire County Council
Ashley Heller	Cambridgeshire County Council
Niamh Matthews	Strategic Programme and Commissioning Manager, Greater Cambridge Partnership
Wilma Wilkie	South Cambridgeshire District Council

## **1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Professor Phil Allmendinger.

## **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interests other than those already recorded in Members' Declaration of Interest forms.

## **3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> July 2017 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairperson.

## **4. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

The Chairperson informed the Executive Board that eight public questions had been submitted all of which related to agenda item 6; Cambourne to Cambridge Better Bus Journey Scheme. The questions would be taken as part of the discussion on this item.

## **5. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE JOINT ASSEMBLY**

The Executive Board **RECEIVED** a report on decisions made at the meeting of the

Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly held on Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> September 2017. Councillor Kevin Price Chairperson of the Joint Assembly attended the meeting to present the Joint Assembly's views as part of the discussion on each item.

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

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

Councillor Bridget Smith, Vice Chairperson of the Local Liaison Forum (LLF) attended the meeting and presented feedback on the LLF's views on the proposals. Councillor Smith expressed concern about the time available for the LLF to comment on the proposals and stressed that expecting 49 reports to be reviewed in a week was unreasonable and compromised good decision-making. She asked that in future reports were issued as they were received. She commented that LLF members were disappointed to hear that they were being viewed negatively by the GCP following suggestions that they were trying to block progress. Councillor Smith emphasised that the LLF, as much as anyone, wanted residents to be able to get to work and leisure cheaply, quickly and reliably. The LLF was keen to ensure that the proposals took account of the best decisions possible, based on all relevant information. Given the proximity of major new information, specifically the mass transit assessment sponsored by the GCP and the Combined Authority, it was sensible to consider waiting for that information, rather than pressing on to spend taxpayers' money on detailed evaluation of options that may conflict with that. The LLF would also welcome a distinction being made between cheaper short term and more expensive long term solutions, which would acknowledge the urgency of some interventions, but allow for the later incorporation of these other schemes. Characterising this negatively as some kind of head in the sand or "go away" attitude, was unfair.

On a more positive note, Councillor Smith reported that the LLF welcomed the decision to drop Crome Lea as a potential park and ride site, but failed to see why the Waterworks site, only 400m away, was materially less damaging and undesirable, given that it was still located after the start of congestion; could still be seen as a blot on the landscape from many miles around; and was still not directly accessible from the A428 in either direction. She welcomed the amendments proposed by the Joint Assembly, which supported a number of the resolutions of the LLF.

Councillor Smith drew the Executive Board's attention to three other areas of concern, which are summarised below:

- There was an anomaly in the figures presented for baseline, off peak journey times. The LLF asked how it was possible that an optimised on-road service, using the uncongested A428 dual carriageway and segregated online bus priority measures to within half a mile of Grange Road, could be so much slower than the current Citi 4 service operating without bus priority measures? Although the peak hours journey time was more important, the off-peak time was an essential baseline; and if that was grossly inaccurate, it called into

question the underlying assumptions.

- The LLF shared concerns expressed at the Joint Assembly regarding the issue of onward travel from Grange Road. It was considered critical that concrete information about onward journeys to the City centre, the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and the Science Park, including credible journey times, was provided in the consultation documentation so that people could provide informed feedback.
- The LLF remained concerned about potential environmental impact and the risk that a busway through the Green Belt would create a barrier to wildlife and block existing wildlife corridors. It asked that the assessment was not too narrow and took account of the wider impact; drawing in as much independent expertise as possible.

In conclusion, Councillor Smith asked that the Executive Board arrange for the LLF to be included in the design and approval of the questions to be asked of the public in the next round of consultation. She suggested that this would head off any criticism afterwards about the impartiality, fairness and balance of the consultation process.

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. Eight questions had been submitted. 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 paper drew attention to the purpose of the report and stressed that the Executive Board was not being asked to approve any particular scheme at this stage. The report being considered presented a range of options and recommendations on how a combination of those options could be put together.

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 specific fixed design proposals, as that would only be appropriate as part of the next stage of work and would require significant additional onsite 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 Executive Board 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 had supported the proposal but had suggested amendments to recommendation (a), which had been agreed unanimously and are shown in italics below:

- (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 .....*

The Executive Board was invited to consider and comment on the recommendations, taking into account feedback from the Joint Assembly, comments from the LLF, questions from the public and officer responses. The response to questions of clarification and the main points of discussion are summarised below:

- In response to a question from Councillor Lewis Herbert about the route options to the east of the M11, it was clarified that ultimately all of the options being considered had the potential to link into a suitable interchange at West Cambridge. Discussions were taking place about where that could be but this would be influenced by where the busses needed to ultimately go and a number of practical factors such as the need for suitable crossing points for an off road solution. Councillor Herbert asked when it came to consulting and comparing the on road options as well as the combination that might be possible between on road and off road, were officers considering the possibility of off road coming on road for a section of the journey and then rejoining off road. In response, it was confirmed that this could be considered as a result of the outcome of the consultation and evaluated appropriately.
- Councillor Bates asked for further clarification of MCAF and its links to WebTAG recommendations from the Department of Transport. It was confirmed that MCAF was a particular tool developed by a consultant and was not in itself a tool taken from WebTAG. However, WebTAG set out a number of possible approaches and MCAF was one of those.
- In response to question from the Chairperson it was confirmed that the Waterworks site had been included in the proposed shortlist on the basis of an assessment against the objective scoring criteria. Referring to the table at the top of page 41, the Chairperson asked on what basis the journey times,

including the base line off peak numbers, had been calculated. In response, it was confirmed that the numbers were projections based on 2031 figures, reflecting local planned development scenarios. The way that this was currently modelled was at a conceptual stage using a combination of assessments. The overall journey time calculations had been discussed with the LLF and officers had explained what assumptions had been made about how busses operated under different road conditions. These figures had been tested for accuracy.

- The Chairperson noted officer comments about the possibility of mixing and matching some of the proposed route alignments where this was considered appropriate. He asked that the consultation make it extremely clear that this was an option. In response to a further question about tunnels, it was clarified that the aim was to secure routes that were future proofed but as proposed at the moment there were no specific plans for tunnels, although this could be incorporated into some of the proposed routes at some point in the future.
- With reference to the telephone survey of over 1,000 users of the potential scheme, it was noted that the research had been commissioned by the County Council's Research Team and had involved a sample drawn from places connected to the proposed corridor, specifically residents from Cambourne, Hardwick, St Neots, Caldecote, Dry Drayton, Highfields, Coton, and Madingley.
- In response to a question from the Chairperson, the Public Transport Projects Team Leader confirmed that he was happy to meet with the LLF Technical Group as requested by the LLF Vice Chairperson. Responding to a further question from Councillor Ian Bates, it was confirmed that officers would engage with the Environment Agency and seek specialist advice on the emerging proposals.
- Councillor Lewis Herbert commenting on the need to seek the public's views on the proposals. He emphasised the importance of making evidence based decisions and confirmed he remained open minded about the way forward. Referring to the options east and west of the M11, he felt there was a need to look at the on road option and was particularly interested in views expressed about Madingley Road. He was supportive of seeking views on a mix and match approach as part of the consultation. With reference to the potential park and ride sites, he supported the proposed shortlist, but highlighted the need for the consultation to address many of the questions raised by the public. With reference to the Local Plan, Councillor Herbert highlighted the need to progress plans to enhance the transport network to support planned development.
- Councillor Ian Bates commented that he had studied the potential routes very carefully. There was a clear need to improve transport links given the level of planned growth in the Cambridge area and beyond. It was crucial that beyond Grange Road, busses went to where the employment was and there was already a considerable amount of data available to inform this. He welcomed the planned consultation and looked forward to hearing what the public had to say, alongside further input from the LLF Technical Group. He was also interested in the Environment Agency's comments on a number of environmental issues raised.
- Mark Reeve supported the recommendations and emphasised the need to establish a level of certainty so that local businesses could plan accordingly.

- The Chairperson confirmed that he was supportive of moving to the next stage in the process. He referred to a recent district council meeting with Parish Councils to discuss rural transport hubs, where there had been a unanimous call for improved public transport provision in the area.

The Executive Board **AGREED** unanimously to:

- (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 set out in the report.

## 7. WESTERN ORBITAL

The Executive Board considered a report which provided an update on further assessment work carried out on the proposed development of the Western Orbital in the context of discussions with Highways England to designate the M11 as a 'Smart Motorway'; evaluation of the Girton interchange; and the GCP's future investment prioritisation. The report also set out planned improvements to existing park and ride provision to provide a short term means of addressing pressures around junction 11 of the M11 and access to the nearby Cambridge Biomedical Campus.

Councillor Bridget Smith, Vice Chairperson of the LLF attended the meeting and presented feedback on the LLF's views on the proposals. Councillor Smith commented that there had been a significant amount of discussion on the park and ride proposals and a number of conflicting views emerged. There had also been some concern about plans to spend this amount of money on a short term measure. While it was accepted that underground expansion was unlikely to be accepted due to the cost, there were also concerns about constructing decking above ground. The LLF had however ultimately accepted that there was a need for a short term intervention to increase the number of spaces within the footprint of the existing site, alongside steps to optimise the site as a pick up and drop off point for busses, particularly those transporting children to school, and increased park and cycle provision. Further comments would be forthcoming as detailed proposals emerged.

The Joint Assembly had recommended that the Executive Board accept the officer recommendations.

The Executive Board was invited to consider and comment on the recommendations, taking into account feedback from the Joint Assembly and comments from the LLF. The response to questions of clarification and the main points of discussion are summarised below:

- Councillor Bates commented that the County Council was the land owner of the park and ride site and its Environment and Transport Committee had sanctioned the Executive Board to consider the proposed expansion of the site by adding an additional 299 spaces. In respect of coaches, there had been

discussions between County Council and City Council officers and Members about this, including arrangements for school drop off and collection.

- Mark Reeve confirmed that from a business perspective the Local Enterprise Partnership was supportive of the proposals.

The Executive Board **AGREED** unanimously to:

- (a) Note the progress to date;
- (b) Delegate the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chairperson, to submit a response to Highways England 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, Park and Cycle options and associated junction improvements; and
- (e) Agree the next steps/timetable detailed in the report.

## **8. DEVELOPING A 10 YEAR (2020 - 2030) FUTURE INVESTMENT STRATEGY**

The Executive Board considered a report 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 resources accordingly. This would build on progress 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. Details of the proposed programme of events were tabled.

The Joint Assembly had unanimously recommended that the Executive Board accept the officer recommendations.

The Executive Board was invited to consider and comment on the recommendations, taking into account feedback from the Joint Assembly. The response to questions of clarification and the main points of discussion are summarised below:

- Mark Reeve referred to the Economic Commission being set up by the Combined Authority and asked that the GCP fully engage with that as part of future conversations.

- Councillor Ian Bates welcomed plans for specific engagement with students and to hold an event at the Addenbrookes concourse.
- Councillor Lewis Herbert commented that there was time to use this feedback to inform how best to spend what was potentially £400m. He highlighted the need to follow up the work of the Transport Working Group and progress the objective to retain car movements, particularly at peak times, to 10 to 15% less than 2011 levels, which he had already discussed with officers. In addition to getting people's views on how the investment should be targeted, Councillor Herbert welcomed the opportunity to have a frank conversation with City and South Cambridgeshire residents and businesses about possible measures for reducing the number of cars coming into the City centre.
- The Chairperson welcomed plans to take a ten year forward look and the move away from constraints of focussing on individual tranches of funding. He also welcomed the Big Conversation proposals to capture the views of business and the public to inform the work of the GCP.

The Executive Board **AGREED** unanimously to:

- (a) Develop a 10 year Future Investment Strategy and support the process set out in paragraphs 11-15 of the report for agreeing priorities; and

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 Future Investment Strategy.

## **9. SKILLS DEVELOPING THE GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP AMBITION**

The Executive Board considered a report 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 so far the skills work stream had made good progress across a number of activities and current projects had been delivered on time and within budget. However, it had not yet been possible to demonstrate a direct and fully evidenced link between the work agreed to date and the 420 apprenticeship deal target set as part of the original City Deal agreement. A number of proposals were being recommended to address this, including setting up a GCP apprenticeship matching/brokerage service with a focus on stem based apprenticeships.

The Joint Assembly had recommended that the Executive Board agree to withdraw the report to enable the Skills Working Group to refine the proposal and report back to the November meeting. This had been agreed with seven votes in favour and six against.

The Executive Board was invited to consider and comment on the recommendations taking into account feedback from the Joint Assembly. The response to questions of clarification and the main points of discussion are summarised below:

- Mark Reeve commented that the aim of the proposal was to identify gaps in provision and find ways of filling those gaps. While there were a number of

providers, there would always be some fringe/niche areas where work was not being done. If the outcome of further discussions was that unmet demand and gaps in the current market could be met through a brokerage service, then the LEP would support that. Further work could be done by the Skills Working Group to clarify and evidence where additionality could be achieved.

- Councillor Lewis Herbert recognised the broad issue as the need to resolve the skills deficit and make sure that not only the needs of businesses were met but also those of the residents of the whole county. This needed to be done alongside work being done by the Combined Authority, the LEP and the education sector. There was currently a mismatch between skills and available job opportunities. He was supportive of agreeing the recommendation, whilst recognising there was a Working Group that could take this work further. This could take account of issues raised by the Joint Assembly.

The Executive Board **AGREED** unanimously:

- (a) To refocus the skills work stream in order to facilitate the delivery of the up to 420 apprenticeship target agreed with Government as part of the City Deal agreement;
- (b) To do this by establishing a GCP apprenticeship matching/brokerage service that has a focus on STEM apprenticeships;
- (c) That officers should work with and commission, where necessary, external organisations to support this work;
- (d) To work with the LEP, the Combined Authority and delivery organisations in the development of a skills strategy, including evaluating this new service to determine whether it would be suitable, in the medium to long term, for roll out across a wider geographical area; and
- (e) That in doing the above to take account of the active involvement of the Skills Working Group.

## 10. GCP QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

The Executive Board considered a report 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; and
- Forward Plan of Executive Board Decisions.

The Joint Assembly had unanimously recommended that the Executive Board accept the officer recommendations.

The Executive Board was invited to consider and comment on the recommendations and the response to questions of clarification and the main points of discussion are summarised below:

- Referring to the Skills Report and the two SETUP indicators, Mark Reeve queried whether it was right to classify them as Red status, given the review had identified that whilst engagement with the website had been lower than anticipated, this was not a reflection on levels of engagement with the service.
- The Chairperson asked that the next GCP progress report include an update on the £40m Section 106 funding that formed part of the GCP budget.
- It was noted that South Cambridgeshire District Council would consider a motion from Councillor Tim Wotherspoon asking the Council to work with the County Council, City Council, Combined Authority and the GCP to undertake a comprehensive review of bus services in and around the district. This included a request for each body to contribute up to £50,000 to co-fund the review. In response to a question from the Chairperson it was confirmed that if the motion was agreed, a paper would be presented to the Executive Board asking it to consider participating in the review. This could be included in the quarterly monitoring report.
- The Chairperson asked for a short progress report setting out what was being done to support cycling. This would also be included in the next quarterly monitoring report.
- It was noted that discussions were taking place about the timing and mechanism for publishing the Rapid Mass Transit Strategic Options Appraisal. It was suggested that a joint launch and question and answer session may be appropriate.
- In response to a question, the Interim Chief Executive commented that officers would consider how to publish the National Infrastructure Commission report, but confirmed that this did not have to be part of an Executive Board agenda. It was acknowledged that it would be useful to include a marker in the November quarterly monitoring report to facilitate an update on any relevant information released as part of Government announcements on the Budget.

The Executive Board **AGREED** unanimously to:

- (a) Note the quarterly progress report and its appendices;
- (b) Redefine the target completion date for the Chisholm Trail cycle links Phase 2, to reflect experience of the planning process for Phase 1 [see paragraph 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 Executive Board **AGREED** the programme of dates for future meetings as set out below:

4.00 p.m. Wednesday 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2017, Council Chamber, The Guildhall Cambridge #  
4.00 p.m. Thursday 8<sup>th</sup> February 2018, Council Chamber, South Cambridgeshire Hall,  
Cambourne  
4.00 p.m. Wednesday 21<sup>st</sup> March 2018, Kreis Viersen Room, Shire Hall, Cambridge  
Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> July 2018 \*  
Thursday 11<sup>th</sup> October 2018 \*  
Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> December 2018 \*

# venue likely to change

\* time and venue to be confirmed

---

**The Meeting ended at 6.10 p.m.**

---