



# GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP

Growing and sharing prosperity

Delivering our City Deal

## GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP JOINT ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Joint Assembly  
Wednesday, 19 July 2017 at 1.00 p.m.

PRESENT:

### Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly:

Councillor Kevin Price	Cambridge City Council (Chairperson)
Councillor Tim Wotherspoon	Cambridgeshire County Council (Vice-Chairperson)
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 City Deal Executive Board in attendance:

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

### Officers:

Rachel Stopard	Interim Chief Executive, GCP
Tanya Sheridan	Programme Director, GCP
Chris Tunstall	Interim Transport Director, GCP
Niamh Matthews	Strategic Programme and Commissioning Manager, GCP
Mike Davies	Cycling Projects Team Leader, GCP
Chris Malyon	Cambridgeshire County Council
Wilma Wilkie	South Cambridgeshire District Council

## 1. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON

Councillor Kevin Price was **ELECTED** Chairperson of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly.

## 2. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRPERSON

Councillor Tim Wotherspoon was **ELECTED** Vice-Chairperson of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly.

## 3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Mark Robertson.

The Chairperson reported the following membership changes and welcomed the new representatives to their first meeting:

Councillor Grenville Chamberlain had been appointed to represent South Cambridgeshire District Council (replacing Councillor Tim Wotherspoon who had been appointed to represent the County Council); and Councillors John Williams and Tim Wotherspoon had been appointed to represent Cambridgeshire County Council (replacing Councillor Roger Hickford and former Councillor Maurice Leeke).

## 4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following declarations of interest were made:

- Councillor Kevin Price declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to agenda item 9 [Milton Road and Histon Road Improvements] as a resident of Milton Road.
- Councillor Dave Baigent declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to agenda item 9 [Milton Road and Histon Road Improvements] as a member of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
- Councillor Bridget Smith declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to agenda item 11 [A428/B1303 Better Bus Journey Scheme] as she was vice-chairperson of the A428 Local Liaison Forum.
- Dr John Wells declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to agenda item 11 [A428/B1303 Better Bus Journey Scheme] as a resident of Hardwick.
- Councillor Grenville Chamberlain declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to agenda item 11 [A428/B1303 Better Bus Journey Scheme] as a resident of Hardwick.
- Andy Williams declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to agenda item 13 [City Access Strategy], recommendation 4, which referred to funding for a potential Rural Hub Park and Ride site serving the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. Mr Williams indicated he would not take part in the discussion or vote on this matter.
- Sir Michael Marshall declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation of agenda item 13 [City Access Strategy], in particular reference to a Work Place Levy as he was a Cambridge employer.

## 5. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 1<sup>st</sup> March 2017 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairperson, subject to the following amendments:

- The inclusion of Helen Valentine in the list of those present;
- The deletion of Andy Williams from the list of those present; and

- Replacing the word 'advised' with 'commented' in the summaries of comments made by Claire Ruskin on pages 9 and 11.

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

The Chairperson informed the Joint Assembly that seventeen public questions had been submitted, fifteen of which would be taken at the meeting under agenda items nine, eleven and fourteen. He reported that, in line with Standing Orders and the public questions protocol, he had exercised Chairperson's discretion and would, on this occasion, only accept questions which specifically related to items on the agenda and where the questioner was able to attend the meeting. This meant two questions would not be received at the meeting, but those concerned would receive a written response. Given the number of questions received, questioners were asked to limit their contribution to one minute.

## **7. PETITIONS**

It was noted that no petitions had been received.

## **8. RAPID MASS TRANSPORT STRATEGIC OPTIONS APPRAISAL**

The Interim Transport Director introduced a report to be presented to the next Executive Board meeting, seeking approval to proceed with a strategic appraisal into rapid, mass transport options. This was a combined proposal to be undertaken on behalf of the GCP and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority. It involved the appointment of a consultant to provide expert independent advice on the most appropriate form of rapid, mass transit for Cambridge City and the surrounding travel to work area. Work would involve a strategic options appraisal on a range of underground and overground rapid transport modes, including light rail, monorail, bus rapid transit and affordable very rapid transport. This would enable the GCP Executive Board and Combined Authority to determine the most appropriate form of rapid, mass transit to meet Greater Cambridge's future transport needs.

It was noted that the total cost was estimated to be in the region of £150,000, half of which was expected to be met by the Combined Authority. The cost to the GCP would therefore be approximately £75,000.

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

- There was general support for the proposal, but there were some concerns about the objectivity of the options appraisal. Councillor Bick sought reassurance that we were looking at a level playing field for this exercise. He noted that this was a joint proposal and recalling comments about addressing Cambridge transport problems made by the Mayor as part of his election campaign, asked whether this would influence the scope of this work. In response the Interim Transport Director confirmed that the Mayor had been involved in developing the proposals and that the brief required a full appraisal of all options. He added that the Mayor would also be mindful of the need to comply with the assurance framework which required a full options appraisal.

- Councillor Bick indicated that, from an economic point of view, the feasibility and viability of many of the potential options would in part depend on complimentary measures outside the scope of this review. He asked how that would be handled and added he would like to have seen an invitation for the consultants to tell us about the potential impact, positive or negative, of other things we could do to make a difference to these choices. The Interim Transport Director agreed that this would be critical. The aim was to future proof all existing schemes and new schemes would need to be seen in the context of other relevant factors. He reminded members that the Board was already looking at a Future Transport Strategy for Greater Cambridge which would be presented to members in due course.
- Some members expressed concern that this work had not been done before now. The Chairperson urged members to put these concerns to one side and look forward.
- Councillor Bridget Smith challenged the suggestion that schemes currently being developed were being future proofed and referred to a recent presentation to the Local Liaison Forum (LLF) on the alignment of the A428 which included sweeping S bends. She had asked if this route was suitable for other forms of rapid, mass transport and had been told 'no'. This suggested a lack of joined up thinking between the aspirations in this paper and what was happening on the ground. The Interim Transport Director explained that those routes were still being developed and reassured Councillor Smith that despite what might have been said at the LLF, officers were looking at future proofed transport corridors.
- In response to a question from Sir Michael Marshall, the Interim Transport Director confirmed that the consultants would be given an open brief and encouraged to consider all potential options. It was hoped to appoint a niche firm specialising in this type of work.
- Councillor John Williams noted the proposals referred to 'Cambridge and its travel to work area'. He asked whether this was the same as the travel to work area defined in the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (TSCSC) adopted in 2014. He also asked that when the different modes of transport were analysed, account would be taken of the price to the user. In order to solve the problem, alternative transport solutions had to be affordable. In response, the Interim Transport Director confirmed that the travel for work area was clearly defined and was even wider than that defined in the TSCSC. He also confirmed that cost had been factored into the operating model. Fare subsidy would also be considered as a means of reducing user cost.
- In response to a question from Helen Valentine about timing, it was noted that a tight timescale was proposed. The plan was to bring a report on the outcome of this work back to the November meetings of the Joint Assembly and Executive Board.
- Councillor Noel Kavanagh asked whether the consultants would be encouraged to look at similar sized cities outside the UK, to identify success stories; including the use of fare subsidy. He also asked for an assurance that account would be taken of the need to reduce pollution and improve air quality. The Interim Transport Director confirmed that this was the case and that these factors had been included in the design brief.
- Dr John Wells noted reference to the consultants engaging with stakeholders and suggested it would be useful to have a session with interested parties to give them an opportunity to bring their thoughts to the study at an early stage, as opposed to

inviting them to comment at the end of the process.

The Joint Assembly considered the officer recommendations being presented to the Executive Board and agreed unanimously that the wording should be amended to include reference to independence and the proposed timescale.

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

- a) Commission a *high quality, independent* strategic options appraisal study into rapid, mass transport options for Cambridge City and the surrounding travel to work area in conjunction with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority *to deliver by November 2017*.
- b) Agree a total budget allocation of £150,000 in 2017/18 for the delivery of the strategic options appraisal study.

Changes to the officer recommendations are shown in italic text.

## 9. **MILTON ROAD AND HISTON ROAD: BUS, CYCLING AND WALKING IMPROVEMENTS, DELIVERY PRIORITIES, LOCAL LIAISON PROCESS AND DESIGN PRINCIPLES**

The Joint Assembly considered a report to be presented to the next Executive Board meeting on future delivery priorities and project timelines for the Milton Road and Histon Road projects.

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 asked would be covered in the officer presentation on the report. Details of the questions and answers are set out in Appendix A to the minutes.

Councillor Jocelyne Scutt, Chairperson of the Milton Road LLF, attended the meeting and presented feedback on the Forum's views on these proposals. Having reflected on the outcomes of a number of workshops, the LLF had prepared 12 resolutions, many of which related directly to the 'Do Optimum' alternative design, whilst others focused on measures to tackle congestion and delays in Cambridge. Details of the resolutions and officer comments were set out in Appendix B to the report. Referring to the recommendations being presented to the Executive Board, Councillor Scutt welcomed the fact that the LLF's alternative design had been used as the basis for the final concept design, but highlighted the fact that the bus lane proposals contained in the final concept remained the sticking point with residents. She also raised outstanding concerns about the siting of trees and cyclist safety. She welcomed confirmation from officers that there would be further engagement on these issues.

With reference to recommendation (c) in the report to the Executive Board, Councillor Scutt referred to an alternative recommendation suggested by the Milton Road Alliance; which if agreed by the Executive Board would be supported the LLF. However, she suggested an alternative amendment to this recommendation by adding the words '*Bearing in mind resolution (d)*' to the beginning. She also suggested the deletion of the word 'process' from the end of resolutions (d) and (e). In response to a question, Councillor Scutt clarified that she had not been formally delegated to propose these amendments on behalf of the LLF, but was making these suggestions as its Chairperson.

The Joint Assembly noted that the Milton Road and Histon Road schemes supported the priority of achieving efficient and reliable movement between key existing and future housing and employment sites. The projects would support the delivery of new housing at Northstowe, Waterbeach and on the northern fringe of Cambridge and would provide improved links with employment sites, such as the Science Park and Cambridge North Station, benefitting residents, commuters and businesses. The projects aimed to provide enhanced infrastructure for busses, to improve service reliability and journey times and encourage greater patronage. They also aimed to enhance the quality and safety of cycling and walking facilities, whilst also enhancing the quality of the streetscape and public realm areas. To avoid creating undue pressure on the road network in Cambridge, it was proposed that the projects would be constructed consecutively rather than concurrently. While both schemes were high priority, the Milton Road scheme had a stronger case for early delivery and would be delivered ahead of Histon Road. A detailed report on the delivery of the Histon Road project would be presented to the November Executive Board meeting.

The Joint Assembly noted that the Executive Board was being asked to approve a 'final concept' design for Milton Road, which would be used as a basis for detailed design work and the preparation of an interim business case to facilitate further public and statutory consultation. Details of the proposals were contained in the report. In relation to the LLF's resolutions, the Interim Transport Director explained that officers had worked on the assumption that they should be adopted unless they conflicted with or compromised significantly individual project objectives, design guidance and standards, or road safety needs.

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

- Councillor Bick indicated that he found it difficult to be enthusiastic about the scheme, which, compared with the original aims, provided a limited set of improvements. These focused on getting the most out of the existing highway; apart from proposals relating to pedestrians and cycling. He was concerned that the information in the report did not include a direct comparison of the impact on journey times in the original 'do optimum' design and what was now proposed. He had asked officers for this information and had been advised that in terms of variations in performance on journey times, when comparing the 'final concept' with 'do optimum' ranging variations in performance were between 25% to 80%; although it was acknowledged these figures contained some imperfections. Councillor Bick was of the opinion that potential improvements would not be sufficient to change the nature of people's choice. He feared that at some future point the GCP would have to look again at ways of adding additional space to the highway, or would be back looking at demand management measures, which should have been looked at as part of this whole exercise in the first place. He also worried that the proposals were not sufficiently future proofed. He congratulated residents for being extremely effective in forcing some sanity in plans for achieving the most out of the existing highway and stressed his concerns were about the strategic transport objectives. In response the Interim Transport Director acknowledged that it was difficult to compare proposals but pointed out this was because the objectives had changed.
- Councillor Bridget Smith congratulated officers for the clear improvement in the quality of reports, but urged them to ensure tables and plans were legible. She also congratulated the residents for their sterling work and appreciated the huge effort by officers to please most of the people, most of the time. She recalled that

in the past the main focus had been modal shift, but now this was being referred to as a measure and asked how we were going to set the baseline for improvements to, evaluation and monitoring of modal shift; given this was a key measure of success of all the infrastructure work being done by the GCP. Councillor Smith also asked how this project would be progressed in the absence of a design guide, specific to the GCP. She recalled that a number of drafts had been prepared, but had yet to be formally approved. She stressed this was critical to the progress of this and other projects. In response the Interim Transport Director acknowledged the problem with legibility of plans and tables and undertook to address this. In relation to the comments made about a design guide, he reported that a Special Planning Document was being prepared by Stephen Kelly and a design guide would come out of that work. In response to a further question from Councillor Smith he explained that the timescale for this had yet to be confirmed. With regard to monitoring modal shift, it was noted that the existing model would be used to measure this.

- Councillor John Williams acknowledged that the proposals had tackled the aim of enhancing the quality and safety of cycling and walking facilities, with the exception of plans for Micham's Corner. where the designs showed cyclists passing parked cars on the off side, which was not something he could support. He suggested that unfortunately the proposals did little to meet the aim of improving infrastructure and improve bus service reliability and journey times and encourage greater patronage. Potential improvements were marginal and it was unlikely the proposals would deliver the improvements to bus journey times we were looking for. He referred to comments from the Mayor of Liverpool, who had challenged the conventional view that bus lanes in themselves improved bus reliability and suggested bus lanes could in certain circumstances contribute to delays. He indicated he would abstain from voting on this item as he felt the proposals did not meet the key objectives.
- Sir Michael Marshall commented that the outcome of the survey would usefully demonstrate where people were going, from and to and why. On behalf of residents he hoped that they would be given really good access to their houses, have good access onto the road and be able to turn easily. He was of the opinion that we should wait to receive strategic proposals from the Combined Authority before progressing too far.
- Councillor Dave Baigent reported that having attended the LLF meeting earlier that week, he sensed a significant change in attitude from that expressed at earlier meetings. He suggested this was as a result of extensive consultation and engagement and congratulated all concerned. In addition, Councillor Baigent highlighted the importance of cyclist and pedestrian safety, which was a key aim of the GCP, and commended the fact that the proposed improvements went a considerable way to achieving this.
- Councillor Kevin Cuffley expressed the view that this was an excellent report and commended the work of officers, the LLF and local residents in working together. He welcomed plans for this engagement to continue as the project progressed.
- Claire Ruskin commented that this was a very gentle outcome, good for residents and those who came into Cambridge by bus, bicycle or walking. However she questioned whether the proposals would make any difference to plans to unlock Cambridge for growth. It was very easy for residents of Cambridge and those living close by to cycle or walk, but this was not the case for those living further

afield. She required something more ambitious to be proposed, designed specifically to drive a modal shift, before she could be persuaded to spend valuable tax revenues on this.

- Andy Williams also welcomed the work done by officers and the LLF and commented on the concept of compromise, balancing the needs of residents, politicians and business. Evidence to date suggested plans for ongoing engagement with the LLF would resolve remaining issues about bus lane length. He stated that a key factor for his staff was reliability and suggested that they didn't care if a journey took 20 or 25 minutes, but wanted to be able to rely on a bus to turn up and be confident it would get them where they wanted to go on time.
- Helen Valentine echoed comments from others about good engagement, compromise and reliability. Her main concern was that a lot of money would be spent to achieve very minor, perhaps negligible improvements. While she was happy to support moving to the next stage, she stressed that before taking a final decision on the scheme, she would need to be convinced this represented value for money.
- Councillor Noel Kavanagh stated he would be interested to see what the effects of Cambridge North Station had on local traffic. The number of bicycles parked at the station was, he suggested, a clear indication of the number of people using cycles to get around. The planned improvements represented excellent news for the cycling community. He acknowledged people's concerns, but felt the proposals represented a good way forward in light of the fact we faced an increasing population and new companies moving to the area and he looked forward to seeing the final proposals.

The Joint Assembly considered the officer recommendations being presented to the Executive Board. In relation to her comments on the need for a design guide, Councillor Bridget Smith proposed the addition of an additional recommendation as set out below:

- (h) Support the completion, approval and adoption of the GCP design guide in order to provide a framework for detailed scheme design.

The proposal was seconded by Councillor John Williams. On being put to the vote, there was an equality of votes, with six votes in favour and six against. The Chairperson used his casting vote to oppose the amendment, which was duly declared lost by 7 votes to 6, with two abstentions.

Councillor Tim Bick proposed an amendment by way of adding an additional recommendation, as set out below:

- (h) Supplement development of this scheme with further consideration of means of achieving modal shift to public transport.

The amendment was seconded and on being put to the vote was declared carried with 9 votes in favour, 0 against and 4 abstentions.

With 11 votes in favour and 3 abstentions, the Joint Assembly agreed to **RECOMMEND** that the Executive Board:

- a) Note the prioritisation of delivery of the Milton Road project ahead of the Histon Road scheme;

- b) Note the Milton Road Local Liaison Forum resolutions set out in Appendix B and agree the responses set out therein;
- c) Agree the 'Final Concept' design shown in Appendix D as a basis for detailed design work and the preparation of an interim business case to facilitate further public and statutory consultation;
- d) Note that wherever highway space permits, opportunities to adopt further aspects of the 'Do Optimum' design will be taken as part of the detailed design process;
- e) Support further engagement with the Milton Road LLF to help inform the detailed design process;
- f) Support discussions with relevant property owners to explore interest in a joint funding approach to potential streetscape and public realm improvements on land outside the public highway outside local shops along Milton Road;
- g) Note the revised project timelines shown in Appendix H and the next steps in project delivery set out in the report; and
- h) *Supplement development of this scheme with further consideration of means of achieving modal shift to public transport.*

## 10. GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

The Joint Assembly considered a report to be presented to the next Executive Board meeting on progress across the GCP programme since March 2017. The report covered:

- The 2016/17 end of year financial outturn report;
- Financial monitoring to May 2017;
- A six-monthly report on Smart Cambridge;
- An update on the independent economic assessment panel;
- An update on the implementation of the Mouchel report recommendations; and
- The Executive Board forward plan of decisions.

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

- Councillor Tim Wotherspoon noted reference to plans to hold a Future of Transport conference in Cambridge and asked if dates had been set. He also expressed interest in being involved in the Economic Assessment Panel's discussions on measuring additionality of interventions in local economic growth. In response, the Strategic Programme and Commissioning Manager reported that the dates for the conference had yet to be confirmed, although the 12<sup>th</sup> November had been proposed. Details would be sent to members in due course. She undertook to discuss involvement in the Panel's discussions with Councillor Wotherspoon outside the meeting.

- Councillor Bridget Smith asked about reference to apprenticeships and noted the report referred to an 18% increase against the preceding year. She felt it was inappropriate to imply that this might be due to the GCP's activity on skills given she had attended a meeting where it was made clear there was no way of measuring the impact of the GCP's work. Councillor Smith asked if there was any information on national trends in apprenticeships to enable members make some judgement about how much of that 18% was down to national trends and how much might be down to us; whether that be the work of the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) or the GCP. In response, the Strategic Programme and Commissioning Manager undertook to make it clear that correlation did not equal cause and to include national comparisons in the next version of this report.
- Councillor Bick referred to extending the interim appointments of GCP staff and asked how decisions on the cost associated with those appointments were made. He suggested this had been done via delegated powers given neither the Joint Assembly or Executive Board had been involved in this. In response, the Section 151 Officer stated that provision for an Interim Chief Executive was built into the budget for the year and that it was a decision of the Executive Board that this should be a finite resource. Given the formation of the Combined Authority and other governance issues, he had consulted with the Executive Board, which was of the view that the time was not right to terminate the current interim arrangements. Mr Malyon had therefore used his delegated powers to extend the appointments to the end of this financial year. In response Councillor Bick expressed his hope that the Executive Board would soon be in a position to take a decision on making permanent appointments.
- Councillor Tim Wotherspoon referred to the response to actions 24 and 26 in the Mouchel Report and drew attention to the grey boxes indicating where action had not yet been scheduled to start. He indicated this highlighted the urgent need to clarify the respective roles of the Mayor, the Combined Authority, the LEP, the GCP and the constituent Councils. Councillor Wotherspoon stressed the need to make sure that no one lost sight of the significance of the Strategic Economic Plan or the need to update the Transport Strategy and put in place a joint committee, or whatever mechanism was chosen to initiate the new Local Plan. In response, the Interim Chief Executive agreed that this was important and informed the Joint Assembly that there was a report being presented to the Combined Authority next week seeking approval to set up an Economic Commission. The GCP would be supporting and playing a role in this.
- In response to a question from Councillor Noel Kavanagh, the Strategic Programme and Commissioning Manager agreed to circulate information to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board on where new homes were planned.

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

- a) Approve a net increase in the operational budget of £104k to be funded from drawing additional funding from the New Homes Bonus resource [Para. 3-5 of the report];
- b) Approve an increase of the budget for the independent economic assessment panel work by £30k from drawing additional funding from the New Homes Bonus resource [Appendix 4 to the report]; and

- c) Delegate authority to the Interim Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chairperson of the Executive Board and the Economy and Environment Portfolio Holder, to sign off the Locality Evaluation Framework and Outline Evaluation Plan [Appendix 4 to the report].

## 11. **A428/A1303 BETTER BUS JOURNEY SCHEME - FURTHER SCHEME DEVELOPMENT UPDATE**

The Joint Assembly considered a report to be presented to the next Executive Board meeting on progress with the A428/A1303 Better Bus Journeys Scheme which was key to meeting the GCP objectives supporting economic growth and the submitted Local Plans. It was noted that the report included an assessment of all potential park and ride sites along the Cambourne to Cambridge corridor. Based on the outcome of this review, the Executive Board was being asked to identify a short list of sites for further development work.

Helen Bradbury, Chairperson of the A428 LLF, attended the meeting and presented feedback on the Forum's views on these proposals. She reported that the LLF had invited Mayor James Palmer to a meeting on Monday evening to discuss where the Cambourne to Cambridge Busway Scheme played into his plans for the future. Following his speech the LLF was concerned that it was unclear how the A428 proposals sat within the strategic vision and with that in mind had made a number of comments and resolutions which are summarised below:

- The GCP was requested to defer decisions on the A428 Busway until such time as the high level mass transit study, as proposed by the GCP and the feasibility studies and light rail options as proposed by the Combined Authority had been completed and published, with adequate time being allowed for the public to review and comment on these documents. To proceed as before regardless of these developments would be on the basis of insufficient evidence and a lack of knowledge of alternative options that could be brought forward and would demonstrate a lack of co-ordination in terms of transport strategy. To proceed otherwise may lead to something incompatible, irreversible and having cost the taxpayer dear.
- With reference to plans to future proof schemes for possible implementation of a form of future mass rapid transit, the GCP was asked to clarify the size and extent of infrastructure that would be required to keep communities safe. The LLF did not consider Option 3a to be suitable for rapid mass transit given its proximity to communities, the infrastructure that would be required to keep those communities safe and its impact on sensitive Green Belt areas. The LLF asked that consideration was given instead to developing a more suitable alignment
- The LLF was of the opinion that the Cambourne to Cambridge busway project should constitute no more than a low intervention solution, along the lines of LLF option 6, including smart transport measures. This would allow those living West of Cambridge to access the City quickly and reliably, yet would be far less expensive and offer greater flexibility if /when rapid mass transit decisions were made. Improvement would be immediate, inexpensive and potentially reversible.
- The LLF wished GCP to note its serious concerns about the Consultant's scoring in Table 15 of the report and suggested that the scoring of options 1, 3a and 6 were heavily skewed in favour of option 3a. The scoring process had been hugely disappointing in the end. The LLF had collaborated in the process, but this

outcome showed a basic disregard for its views; in particular the September 2016 assessments. The consultants had stated they would issue a rebuttal, but that was not what the LLF wanted. Instead it wanted to continue to collaborate and arrive at a solution based on the criteria set in the first place.

- The LLF also had concerns about the way park and ride sites had been selected, specifically why the top three highest scoring sites were not included in the shortlist. As this would have been the most logical outcome, LLF asked why two sites at Madingley Mulch had been included retrospectively, including again Crome Lea. As for the new proposal under the water tower [Madingley Road West], the LLF would like to draw the Joint Assembly's attention to the fact that this would be visible from three counties, one as far as 12 miles away.
- The LLF reiterated its view that it would like to see the GCP consider again investigating inbound flow control. A resolution to this effect had been passed at the meeting in March, but to date no response had been received. In addition the LLF would very much like a reply to its letter to the GCP dated 3<sup>rd</sup> July which expressed concerns about the way the workshops had been organised.

At this stage in the proceedings the Chairperson invited Carolyn Postgate to ask her question on this item, which had been submitted in line with the provisions of Standing Orders. He explained that a response to the question would be covered in the officer presentation on the report. Details of the question and answer are set out in Appendix A to the minutes.

The Interim Transport Director in introducing the report clarified that it restated the position reached at the last Executive Board meeting, where it had been agreed to look at other park and ride sites. The consultant had advised looking at a range of possible sites in three zones, which is why additional sites were considered. What the report had done was look at the sites purely from an environmental element. Following the Executive Board's decision on a short list, further work would be done on these sites, bringing transport back into the equation. The outcome of this work would be brought to the September meeting round.

In relation to the LLF's suggestion that the consultant had skewed the scores, the Interim Transport Director did not accept this assertion. In doing so he drew attention to the fact that what was being put forward for the Executive Board to agree had not ruled option 6 out, but instead asked for further work to be done. Many of the concerns raised would be addressed as part of the September report, which would include far more information than currently available. In response to comments made about the LLF's views on scoring not being available it was noted that this had been included in the background papers. The Interim Transport Director pointed out that the LLF's resolutions emerged from a meeting earlier that week so it had not been possible to respond to them in the report which had already been published. This information would be incorporated into the September report. Referring to the outstanding response to the 3<sup>rd</sup> July letter, he explained that this was awaiting the outcome of a more general review of improving engagement with LLFs.

The Joint Assembly was invited to consider and comment upon the recommendations being presented to the Executive Board, taking into account feedback from the Local Liaison Forum (LLF), public questions and officer responses. The main points of discussion are summarised below:

- Councillor Granville Chamberlain spoke in support of the comments of the Chairperson of the LLF. The LLF had done an excellent job and had undertaken a

good degree of technical work and that technical work deserved detailed consideration by officers. He drew attention to the flexible approach taken to the Milton Road proposals referred to earlier in the meeting, that he would like to see applied to the A428 project. Councillor Chamberlain was concerned to hear that the consultant proposed to issue a rebuttal and suggested this was unhelpful. He stated that we would see in the fullness of time, the need for an off road transport corridor. Whether this was for busses or trams was irrelevant at this time, but it was important that the corridor served the communities along its path and didn't seek to damage them. Councillor Chamberlain also drew attention to the impact of work on the Girton interchange and pointed out that as further development came on stream, queues would only get longer. The likelihood was that a demand for an off road solution would quickly build and his view was that this would need to run alongside the route of the A428 in order to minimise the impact on the environment. He hoped that every effort would be made to encourage Highways England to bring forward the Girton interchange developments as that was a critical factor that impacted on the rest of Cambridge.

- Councillor John Williams supported plans to proceed with further work but the consideration of the next steps should be based on a level playing field and include all relevant evidence. He doubted whether we would be in a position to do this by September. The outcome of the planned rapid mass transit options study was relevant and ought to be taken into account. Councillor Williams also questioned whether full account had been taken of the potential impact on Sites of Special Scientific Interest.
- Councillor Bridget Smith highlighted the excellent work done by the A428 LLF which was working very well these days and echoed the concerns expressed by others about the consultant's comments about rebuttal. She also expressed concern about the inclusion of Crome Lea in the proposed shortlist and urged members to consider whether they would ever be in a position to support this option. Money should not be spent working up detailed options that would never be approved. She recalled an earlier decision to reduce the size of the site to minimise the negative impact on Coton and drew attention to a requirement for all sites to be future proofed and capable of expansion. She asked where was the scope to expand a site that had already been reduced because expansion was deemed to be environmentally unacceptable. Councillor Smith also highlighted the suggestion that it was premature to be taking these decisions pending the outcome of work on strategic rapid mass transport options and asked how we could possibly take these decisions without knowing the outcome of this work.
- Sir Michael Marshall asked whether consideration had been given to applying for Highways Agency funding for by-passes in respect of the A14 interchange. He added that if the Government could be persuaded to progress this it would go some way to alleviating congestion problems. The Interim Chief Executive reassured members that officers were working very closely with Highways England on options for improving Girton and she and the Chairperson of the Board had met with the Agency's Chief Executive and kicked off some work with a view to bringing back some recommendations to the November round of meetings. At the same time additional work was being done to see if there were any short term measures that could be taken to improve the situation.
- Andy Williams indicated he didn't like the prospect of waiting and having seen the costings for the A14 interchange and while he was happy to lobby the Government to progress this, early progress was unlikely. He was supportive of comments

made about Crome Lea and referring to earlier discussions about this option, confirmed he would not be willing to vote for this as the preferred site irrespective of the outcome of any further work.

- Councillor Tim Bick recalled he shared concerns about the Crome Lea site when it was last discussed and was very nervous about what the choice of Crome Lea would mean environmentally. He asked officers to confirm why it was considered appropriate to keep in two sites around Madingley Mulch and what we would potentially be missing if we axed one of those now. With reference to suggested delay of the project, Councillor Bick indicated he was not supportive of this, while he appreciated the benefits of partnership working and liaison with the Combined Authority, his perception of the Mayor's involvement in this was he was not setting good foundations for partnership working and playing politics with this from outside the process was not helpful. In response to the question the Interim Transport Director stated that while he understood what was being said, he felt officers had been working with the LLF and the report had been prepared to respond to questions the LLF had raised, which had included queries about looking at Crome Lea in more detail. He added nothing was being set in tablets of stone at this stage. The September report would consider the shortlisted sites in more detail and select a site [or sites] and route [or routes] that would be the subject of detailed consultation.

The Joint Assembly considered the officer recommendations being presented to the Executive Board.

Councillor Bridget Smith moved an amendment to insert the words 'excluding the site at Crome Lea Farm' after 'development work' in the first line of recommendation (b). The amendment was duly seconded by Andy Williams and on being put to the vote was declared carried, with 9 votes in favour, 1 against and 4 abstentions.

Councillor Smith moved a further amendment to amend recommendation (d) to read as follows:

Agree the next steps whilst amending the timetable to take account of the Greater Cambridge Partnership/Combined Authority study on Rapid Mass Transport.

The amendment was duly seconded and on being put to the vote was declared lost with 3 votes in favour and 11 against.

With 13 votes in favour and 1 abstention, the Joint Assembly agreed to **RECOMMEND** that the Executive Board:

- a) Note the progress to date on the scheme development;
- b) Agree a short list of Park and Ride (P&R) sites for further development work, *excluding the site at Crome Lea Farm*, to enable a decision to be made at the September Board for a preferred site or sites to be consulted on;
- c) Agree if further work is to be undertaken in respect of an Option 6 alignment; and
- d) Agree the next steps/ timetable detailed in the report.

## 12. CROSS-CITY CYCLING - DETERMINATION OF TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS

The Cycling Projects Team Leader introduced a report to be presented to the next Executive Board meeting seeking approval for a number of Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) associated with the five Cross City Cycling Schemes approved by the Executive Board in June 2016. It was noted that TROs and formal notices had been advertised for the following scheme elements:

- Fulbourn Road (Robin Hood junction to ARM main entrance), no waiting at any time;
- Hills Road (Purbeck Road to Addenbrooke's roundabout), a loading ban operating 07.00-10.00 and 16.00-19.00, Monday to Friday, and an extension of no waiting at any time into the length between Long Road and Addenbrooke's main entrance;
- Green End Road (Scotland Road to Water Lane and Evergreens to Kendal Way), no waiting at any time with short length of waiting limited to 2 hours outside the shops;
- Green End Road, proposed 'speed cushions'; and
- B1047 Fen Ditton, proposed 'raised table' junction.

Details of objections, comments and letters of support were set out in the report.

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

- Councillor John Williams confirmed that the Fulbourn Road proposals had the support of the Parish Council.
- Helen Valentine expressed strong support for the Hills Road proposals. She noted recommendation (d) referred to receiving in future only Orders that had received objections and asked for further information. In response the Cycling Projects Team Leader clarified that for these schemes, in addition to the objections, members would also receive details of comments and letters of support, so the TRO could be considered in the context of all feedback received.

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

- a) Note the objections and comments received;
- b) Approve the orders and notices as advertised;
- c) Inform the objectors accordingly; and
- d) Receive in future only those Orders that have received objections.

## 13. CITY ACCESS STRATEGY

The Interim Transport Director introduced a report to be presented to the next Executive Board meeting detailing progress with delivery of the City Access Strategy, which aimed to reduce traffic flows through the city, with the provision of more sustainable alternatives. He drew attention to plans to carry out further consultation and engagement with residents and the business communities in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. This would focus on their transport needs and issues and would form part of a wider Travel Diary exercise and inform further work on demand management. The report contained

information on ongoing discussions about the implications and potential impact of a Work Place Levy (WPL) and studies commissioned to look at electric hybrid busses; a traffic signals review and on-street parking. The Interim Transport Director also highlighted ongoing proposals for a Rural Hub Park and Ride service to be located at the soon to be closed Papworth Hospital, serving the Biomedical Campus.

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

- Councillor Tim Bick, while welcoming the diverse report, commented that it demonstrated that when it came to having an overall strategy for the city center, there was much more work to be done. Members had heard from the professionals time and time again there was a need for carrots and sticks and it was clear stronger leadership was required to take the difficult decisions needed. He welcomed plans for electric busses which he saw as an interesting and exciting development. While this wouldn't in itself solve the problem it would make the congestion 'more healthy' and also perhaps make the public transport option more attractive for people to take. He asked for more discussion on the commissioning model before this was adopted and suggested there were benefits of getting a mix of models and manufacturers. Councillor Bick drew attention to reference to locating a charging point at Drummer Street and questioned whether this was appropriate given Drummer Street was already exceeding maximum capacity. Alternative options on the perimeter of the network should be sought. He asked for clarification of reference to the proposed Papworth bus service being a planning requirement. Responding to the questions raised the Interim Transport Director confirmed that the task and finish working group would look at other demand measures and a report on this would be presented to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in due course. He agreed that Drummer Street was not a suitable option, but noted this suggestion had come from the consultants. Other possible sites were being investigated.
- Councillor Bridget Smith asked about Nottingham's WPL. She also highlighted the importance of letting employers know what they were getting in return for the levy. With reference to the Papworth bus service she stressed it was important to recognise that the proposals were based on the needs of existing staff which would change over time. This should therefore be seen as a more short to medium term solution. In response the Interim Transport Director clarified that Nottingham was the only location to implement WPL and this had been introduced as a revenue raising measure as opposed to a way of addressing congestion. Officers were talking to businesses about how the levy would be spent if it was decided to go down this route. He confirmed that the Papworth proposals were short term and GCP's funding had been limited to 3 years.
- Sir Michael Marshall suggested that the option of introducing a congestion charge should be considered again because the WPL would fall very unevenly, would cause huge problems for employers and there had been mixed reactions to it. Most of the impact would be on big companies on the edge of the City rather than those located in the middle.
- Councillor Dave Baigent welcomed the report, in particular plans to reduce congestion in Cambridge and improve air quality. He was concerned that lack of clean air was killing people and put future generations at risk. Councillor Baigent also welcomed the proposal to invest in electric busses and suggested that the

GCP should purchase some busses to run itself as a small experimental bus company. In response, the Interim Transport Director explained that the GCP could not deregulate bus services. He pointed out that the Mayor could have the power if he wished. It was however possible for the GCP to provide buses for the park and ride schemes and this was under consideration.

- Councillor Noel Kavanagh welcomed the recruitment of additional project staff to support the Cycling Provision workstream and referred the roll out and expansion of the Ofo bike sharing scheme. He asked whether there was a danger that welcoming a scheme like this would reduce the availability of secure bicycle parking, which was already in short supply. In response, the Interim Transport Director confirmed Ofo was a private enterprise outside GCPs control, but he was aware that the City Council had been involved in discussions with them.
- Dr John Wells drew attention to reference in the report to electric busses bringing significant decarbonisation and suggested there was a need to be careful about the language used. It should be acknowledged that electric busses did create CO<sub>2</sub> because the electricity had to be generated somewhere. The technical way of looking at the benefit of electric busses was they spread average emissions, not marginal ones. Dr Wells stressed this was not to say that the proposals did not improve localised pollution and may bring benefits in terms of greenhouse gasses, but we shouldn't overstate the benefits. In response, the Interim Transport Director acknowledged that there was a lot more work to be done on busses. He pointed out that the plan was to move towards green electricity, but accepted the points raised by Dr Wells. He added that the only emission free busses were hydrogen busses, but the cost of these was extremely high.
- Councillor Tim Wotherspoon sought clarification of reference to plans to build a 600 space multi-story car park at the Cambridge Biomedical Campus not proceeding. He also drew attention to reference to urban traffic speeds being among the lowest in the country (page 212 of the agenda pack) and suggested this may in part be as a result of there being 184 individual sets of traffic signal in Cambridge; around half the total within Cambridgeshire. In response, the Interim Transport Director confirmed that the multi-story car park would not proceed. Planning requirements involved the production of a travel plan, but there was no requirement for Papworth to provide funding. However they were part of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, with whom discussions about funding were taking place.
- Claire Ruskin welcomed the report which detailed a number of actions, but there remained much to do before improvements were seen on the ground. There was an urgent need to improve city centre access recognising lots of employment and businesses were based in the centre of town. She suggested some businesses were moving out because of the lack of access to their sites. Ms Ruskin expressed concern that Ofo's plans to expand its operation could impact on small independent operators already in Cambridge.
- Councillor Kevin Price reported he had discussed with the Mayor the possibility of him taking action on bus deregulation and had not received an outright no. Mayor Palmer had indicated that he needed to investigate this further, which would suggest there was scope for the GCP to lobby him on this matter if it was considered appropriate.

With 11 votes in favour, 1 abstention and 1 with one member taking no part in the discussion due to a non-pecuniary interest, the Joint Assembly agreed to **RECOMMEND** that the Executive Board:

- a) Note the updates;
  - b) Note the feasibility studies and receive further reports in September on the findings and recommendations in respect of:
    - i. Use of Electric/ Hybrid buses; and
    - ii. A review of the Cambridge Traffic Signal network;
  - c) Agree to carry out further consultation and engagement with residents and the business community in both Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire on their transport needs and issues, as part of a wider 'Travel Diary' exercise, to help understand existing travel patterns, issues and incentives to change; including working with businesses to understand needs of employees from travel to work areas outside of the Greater Cambridge area; and
    - i. To determine local transport priorities that could receive funding were a Workplace Parking Levy (WPL) to be introduced, building on employers' evidence of transport needs and in coordination with the Greater Cambridge Partnership;
    - ii. To coordinate with and, if feasible, form part of the GCP and the Local Enterprise Partnership's broader engagement with the business community;
    - iii. To develop and provide practical support for employers and schools looking to manage their parking demand and provision working closely with Travel for Cambridge;
- and report back the findings to a future meeting of the Board; and
- d) Agree that the Director of Transport continues to negotiate a potential funding contribution for a Rural Hub Park and Ride service to be located at the soon-to-be-closed Papworth Hospital serving the Cambridge Biomedical Campus; and that a report be brought back to the next meeting.

#### **14. IMPROVING GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP GOVERNANCE**

The Joint Assembly considered a report to be presented to the next Executive Board meeting seeking agreement of a package of proposals to strengthen governance arrangements of the GCP. The aim was to make better use of the expertise of Joint Assembly members earlier in the project and programme development lifecycle; to strengthen pre-decision scrutiny and clarify roles and responsibilities. The report also set out how the public questions process was being improved and stakeholder engagement strengthened.

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 asked had been included in the officer presentation on the report. Details of the questions and answers are set out in Appendix A to the minutes.

The Chairperson reported that this was the last meeting Tanya Sheridan, Programme Director would attend. He thanked Tanya for the support and advice she had provided to him during his time as Vice Chairperson; sentiments he was sure would be shared by the former Chairperson. He also thanked Tanya on behalf of the Joint Assembly and wished her well for the future.

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

- Councillor Bridget Smith who had been involved in the Working Group commented that she would be abstaining on this matter as there had been an opportunity to do something far more radical. Her main concern was that too much power was in too few hands. However, having said that she confirmed she was happy to do her best to make this work and help make it a success. She was pleased to see plans for a review in 12 months time. Councillor Smith also expressed her thanks to Tanya for her work over the past two years.
- Councillor Tim Bick commented that there were some good things being proposed and he welcomed the move to a Portfolio Holder arrangement; although he had some reservations that the portfolios were very unequal in size. He also welcomed plans for the Joint Assembly to control its own work programme. He was worried about the private nature of the proposed working groups; in particular the risk of driving underground the discussion of options. Councillor Bick considered he and other members had a role to play in making sure this didn't happen and to ensure that all the options were meaningfully debated in public. He commented that there was a functional problem in that the public expected and deserved to see deliberative decision making, which was not possible under current arrangements where the deliberation took place in one forum and the decision making happened in another. Councillor Bick was of the opinion that Executive Board meetings were very sterile in nature and likened proceedings to a series of supreme court judges announcing pre packed decisions, with no discussion between them. He saw no benefit in having the two separate bodies. A more radical solution would have addressed this and hopefully this could be revisited in future.

With 12 votes in favour and 1 abstention the Joint Assembly agreed to **RECOMMEND** that the Executive Board:

- a) Agrees the Portfolios, the generic portfolio role description and their allocation between Board members (Appendix 1);
- b) Agrees to the creation of the five, portfolio-themed informal Board and Joint Assembly Working Groups to bring the energy and expertise of Joint Assembly members to strategy and project development earlier and agrees their membership and terms of reference (Appendix 2);
- c) Agrees Board meetings should be 2-monthly during 2018, with a review of frequency midway through the year;
- d) Agrees there should be a longer interval between the Assembly and Board of around 3 weeks as soon as practicable and notes the proposed reporting improvements of that advice at appendix 3;
- e) Agrees the principles for officer delegations and scheme of delegation for the Greater Cambridge Partnership in Appendix 4;

- f) Notes and endorses the principles for the setting of the Joint Assembly work programme in Appendix 5;
- g) Agrees to a review of governance arrangements commencing a year after implementation, to consider how effective the changes have been; and
- h) Notes other actions taken to improve public questions and ensure all Executive Board member declarations of interest are up to date.

The Joint Assembly **AGREED** unanimously that, subject to the Executive Board's decision on the package of measures to strengthen governance and member involvement (as summarised in recommendations a – h above), to:

- a) Agree its nomination of members to the proposed Portfolio Working Groups as set out below:

### **Housing and Strategic Planning**

Councillor Lewis Herbert \*  
Councillor Kevin Price  
Councillor Tim Wotherspoon  
Councillor John Williams  
Andy Williams

### **Transport**

Councillor Ian Bates \*  
Councillor Tim Bick  
Councillor Noel Kavanagh  
Sir Michael Marshall  
Dr John Wells  
Councillor Kevin Cuffley  
Helen Valentine  
Councillor Bridget Smith

### **Skills**

Mark Reeve \*  
Councillor Bridget Smith  
Sir Michael Marshall  
Mark Robertson  
Councillor Kevin Price  
Councillor Kevin Cuffley

### **Smart Places**

Councillor Francis Burkitt \*  
Claire Ruskin  
Helen Valentine  
Andy Williams  
Councillor Tim Wotherspoon  
Councillor John Williams  
Councillor Dave Baigent

## **Economy and Environment**

Professor Phil Allmendinger \*  
Councillor Tim Bick  
Claire Ruskin  
Dr John Wells  
Councillor Noel Kavanagh  
Councillor Grenville Chamberlain  
Councillor Dave Baigent

\* proposed Portfolio Holder/Executive Board Member;

- b) Agree the draft principles for setting its Work Programme (at appendix 5 to the report), which set it within the overall Greater Cambridge Partnership governance framework; and
- c) Agree to a Joint Assembly work shop on the work programme, to be scheduled around the turn of the year.

## **15. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** that the next meeting would take place at 2.00 p.m. on Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> September 2017 at the Guildhall, Cambridge.

---

**The Meeting ended at 6.05 p.m.**

---