

GCP engagement and LLF review – Action plan

Summary

In 2017, the Greater Cambridge Partnership commissioned [external reviews](#) on its approach to community engagement and consultation and to the use of traditional Local Liaison Forums for community involvement on the development of major infrastructure schemes.

The following action plan sets out the recommendations made in the respective reviews and GCP action.

| Recommendation | Action | Owner | Status |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Engagement & Consultation | | | |
| 1. Future transport consultation exercises are pre-empted by broader engagement and an advertising campaign that advances the overall messages of the Partnership | Launch public awareness drive | Beth Durham | GCP's Our Big Conversation public engagement exercise carried out September – November 2017 Learning from this adopted as part of on-going communications & engagement strategy |
| 2. Adopt tackling peak-time congestion as a benchmark for future engagement exercises whilst a) Adopting targeted approach to social media b) Fewer + high footfall, weekend exhibitions. | a) Adopt best practice approach to engagement/consultation b) Increase use of targeted social media engagement c) Implement revised approach to face-to-face events | Beth Durham | a) Best practice adopted for subsequent engagement and consultation exercises including improved use of consumer insight analysis (Moasic) to identify and target key audiences. Subsequent consultation (Cambourne to Cambridge, 2017) quality assured as meeting good practice by The Consultation Institute. Each exercise |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | <p>evaluated and reviewed for continuous improvement.</p> <p>b) Targeted social media engagement now used on regular basis as part of an integrated plan to positive effect.</p> <p>c) Key recommendation now sees GCP using existing or high footfall locations for face to face engagement across seven day week, including social/sport/leisure events and venues, community fairs, transport hubs etc.</p> |
| <p>3. Provide a greater lead-in time to adequately plan and secure stakeholder buy-in prior to public consultation.</p> | <p>Plan and manage stakeholder engagement prior to public consultation exercises</p> | <p>GCP Programme Team (all)</p> | <p>A governance review of the GCP structure was undertaken and recommendations implemented in 2017. This allows for early Assembly/Board and partner involvement in policy formation prior to publication & consultation.</p> <p>Each scheme works to a stakeholder engagement plan which is continuously updated, to ensure regular and tailored engagement with stakeholders. Draft consultation materials are now with focus groups and/or key stakeholders and the Community Sounding Group prior to publication and feedback taken on board as far as possible.</p> |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>4. Introduce public engagement at the earliest scoping stages of a project.</p> | <p>Implement improved pre-consultation engagement</p> | <p>Central programme Team/Transport Team</p> | <p>New schemes from 2017 onwards projects have been subject to pre-consultation engagement, to seek feedback and to build understanding and support. This approach has been adopted as best practice. Examples include: Our Big Conversation (City Access); Greenways, Rural Travel Hubs, Making Space for People</p> |
| <p>5. Prioritise social media and digital advertising channels for future publicity and engagement.</p> | <p>Prioritise social media and digital advertising channels for future publicity and engagement</p> | <p>Beth Durham</p> | <p>Digital channels now form an integral part of all engagement and consultation exercises which are tailored to each scheme/theme; the approach is regularly evaluated and tested to ensure information remains accessible through a range of channels. Website traffic and social media engagement has increased and public access to the decision-making process has improved through the introduction of live-streaming of key meetings.</p> |
| <p>Local Liaison Forums</p> | | | |
| <p>1. The existing LLFs should continue to be 'owned' by the elected representatives for the areas covered by schemes and to appoint their own chairs</p> | <p>Update ToR to clarify, embed and standardise role of elected representatives</p> | <p>Beth Durham</p> | <p>Post-review engagement held with LLF Chairs/Vice Chairs in December 2017 and May 2018. Agreement for standardised ToR. Further engagement required on fresh place-based approach.</p> |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>2. To avoid confusion and duplication with the Joint Assembly's formal advisory role it would seem most appropriate for LLFs to advise the Transport Portfolio Holder and senior lead officer.</p> | <p>Update ToR to standardise and confirm reporting mechanism for LLFs into scheme/decision-making</p> | <p>Executive Board</p> | <p>Reporting mechanisms for Community Forums being updated as part of community engagement review; for Board decision September/October.</p> |
| <p>3. It seems questionable whether Board and Assembly members should also be LLF members because in practice they end up having to consider advice which they themselves are a party to. In such instances (i.e. where a local ward councillor is an Assembly or Board member) observer membership may be more appropriate.</p> | <p>Update ToR to confirm LLF membership options for existing Assembly/Executive Board members</p> | <p>Executive Board</p> | <p>Confirmed existing JA/EB members should only have observer status on LLFs or, alternatively relinquish JA/EB role; for Board decision September/October.</p> |
| <p>4. The specific objectives of each scheme should be prominently published. Constraints on the use of the Government's Partnership money need to be clearly communicated to all members of the forums. In this context, there may be merit in Board members attending meetings, where</p> | <p>Prominently publish scheme objectives.</p> <p>Board members to consider attending community meetings</p> | <p>Beth Durham Transport Team Executive Board</p> | <p>Scheme objectives prominently published on website, marketing literature and JA/EB reports</p> <p>On-going work to standardise community engagement presentations to ensure objectives made prominent.</p> <p>Board attendance at some community meetings.</p> |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| appropriate, to help clarify the objectives of the Partnership. | | | |
| 5. LLF agendas should be developed in close cooperation with senior officers, who should be able to highlight departures from the terms of reference to the Transport Portfolio Holder. LLF chairs should rule out of order proposals which fall outside of the project scope as defined in their terms of reference. | Update ToR to clarify and standardise roles and responsibilities | Beth Durham | Post-review engagement held with LLF Chairs/Vice Chairs in December 2017 and May 2018. Agreement for standardised ToR. Further engagement required on fresh place-based approach. Reporting mechanisms for Community Forums being updated as part of community engagement review; for Board decision September/October. |
| 6. Where they have the potential to meet Partnership objectives and are consistent with the agreement with Government, alternative proposals developed by LLFs should be examined carefully, but proportionately, alongside options developed by Council officers and the results of that analysis published and debated. Where appropriate they should be included in public consultations and opinion research. | GCP to consider community-generated proposals | Peter Blake | GCP regularly explores viable, policy compliant suggestions for Local Liaison Forums and includes these, as appropriate, in public consultation proposals. |
| 7. In practice certain interests and views may come to dominate others. Skilful facilitation and chairing may | Meeting with LLF Chairs/Deputies to discuss | Beth Durham | LLF workshop held May 2018 – Chairs/Vice Chairs reported no training required; option remains available. |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>be required in order to maintain wide participation and to keep debate flowing. The Council should discuss with LLF chairs what support and training it could offer to assist them in carrying out their functions.</p> | | | |
| <p>8. LLF chairs and officers should work together to improve the way meetings are run. Officer support for meetings should be reviewed to ensure that those attending are well-prepared and have the skills to respond to the challenges that come their way. Papers should be sent out well in advance of meetings, with sufficient time allowed to agree agendas in good time. Complaints about inadequate venues, lack of microphones and lack of evidence should be investigated and, where necessary, addressed.</p> | <p>Meeting with LLF Chairs/deputies</p> <p>Updated ToR to address issues outlined</p> | <p>Beth Durham</p> | <p>Dedicated business support officer recruited to increase administrative capacity/consistency November 2018</p> <p>LLF workshop held May 2018 to agree requirements</p> <p>Updated ToR on-going as part of community engagement review. For Board approval September/October.</p> <p>High quality projector and audio equipment, including microphones, purchased as part of GCP events kit.</p> |
| <p>9. The Board should continue to carry out formal consultation on schemes, should welcome representations from stakeholders and should consider commissioning opinion research to obtain the fullest representation of the</p> | <p>Consider opinion research to obtain widest possible representation of views.</p> <p>Make consultation results available to LLFs</p> | <p>GCP programme team County Council Research Team</p> | <p>Implemented. Opinion research commissioned where considered appropriate (eg Our Big Conversation, Cambourne to Cambridge) GCP/County Council exploring procurement of market research supplier</p> |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| views of the community and to act as a 'reality check' on the advice it is receiving from the LLFs. The results of these consultations and of this opinion research should be made available to the LLFs to inform their deliberations. | | | |
| 10. Mechanisms should be developed to bring together people with opposing views in an attempt to resolve differences and build a consensus. | Explore channels for bringing together range of views | Programme Team Executive Board | A number of mechanisms have been introduced by GCP to bring together people with opposing views. Of relevance to major infrastructure projects are the standard use of facilitated workshops on key issues. |
| 11. Consideration should be given to how to widen future debates about Greater Cambridge's problems and how best to address them and how a fuller opportunity can be provided to local communities to initiate scheme proposals for inclusion in future local transport plans. | | For member/leadership discussion & agreement | GCP initiated a broader discussion on the challenges and opportunities brought about by the Greater Cambridge growth story as part of the Big Conversation in autumn 2017. GCP members and senior officers regularly involved in local discussions and debates. Pre-consultation engagement on new schemes has been introduced to provide greater local communities input. Development of new LTP will be managed by the Combined Authority in 2018-19. |
| 12. A full review of LLFs should be carried out once the detailed design of the | | Joint GCP/CCC issue | For future Board decision |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>schemes has been agreed. This should enable the Board to conclude whether to ask the LLFs to continue to advise through the delivery and review stages and how LLFs can play an effective role in relation to future schemes.</p> | | | |
| <p>13. Council-run workshops with external facilitators have generally been seen as successful. The benefits of independent chairing should be considered when setting up LLFs to support future schemes.</p> | | <p>For member/leadership discussion & agreement</p> <p>Value for money discussion required</p> | <p>Independent chairing/facilitation remains an option as agreed with Chairs.</p> |