



**GREATER
CAMBRIDGE
PARTNERSHIP**

Growing and sharing prosperity

— Delivering our City Deal —

GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP JOINT ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
held on Thursday, 20 September 2018 at 2.00pm at the Offices of South Cambridgeshire District
Council, Cambourne.

PRESENT:

Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly:

Councillor Tim Wotherspoon	Cambridgeshire County Council (Chairperson)
Councillor Tim Bick	Cambridge City Council (Vice Chairperson)
Councillor Dave Baigent	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Nicky Massey	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Noel Kavanagh	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor John Williams	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Ian Sollom	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Peter Topping	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Eileen Wilson	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Heather Richards	Transversal
Jo Sainsbury	iMET
Christopher Walkinshaw	Cambridge Ahead
Andy Williams	AstraZeneca
Helen Valentine	Anglia Ruskin University
Dr John Wells	Cancer Research UK Cambridge Institute

Members or substitutes of the GCP Executive Board in attendance:

Councillor Ian Bates, GCP Transport Portfolio Holder	Cambridgeshire County Council
Claire Ruskin, GCP Smart Places Portfolio Holder	Business Representative

Officers/advisors:

Peter Blake	Transport Director, GCP
Beth Durham	Communications Manager, GCP
Niamh Matthews	Head of Strategy and Programme, GCP
Rachel Stopard	Chief Executive, GCP
Kathrin John	Democratic Services, South Cambridgeshire District Council
Victoria Wallace	Democratic Services, South Cambridgeshire District Council

1. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Christopher Walkinshaw declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to agenda item 10 as he was employed by Marshalls of Cambridge on Cambridge Road.

Andy Williams declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to agenda item 9 (West of Cambridge Package (M11/Junction 11 Park and Ride)) as AstraZeneca would be moving to the Biomedical Campus.

3. JOINT ASSEMBLY MEMBERSHIP

Councillor Dave Baigent was welcomed back as a member of the Joint Assembly. The Chairman noted that Councillor Baigent had replaced Councillor Kevin Price as a City Council representative on the Joint Assembly and, on behalf of the Joint Assembly, recorded thanks to Councillor Price for his contributions to the work of the GCP as a member of the Joint Assembly.

It was noted that Dr Wells would be continuing as a member of the Joint Assembly.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 June 2018 were agreed as a correct record of the meeting.

8. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

One public question had been received. Councillor Dr. Jocelynn Scutt was invited to ask her question which related to agenda item 11 (Place Based Public Engagement Strategy). The question and a summary of the response is provided at Appendix A to the minutes.

6. PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

7. A428 CAMBOURNE TO CAMBRIDGE PUBLIC TRANSPORT SCHEME

This item had been deferred until the November 2018 meeting of the Joint Assembly to allow the completion of detailed technical work by the Combined Authority's consultants. This was aimed at ensuring the scheme met alignment requirements with the Cambridge Area Metro (CAM) network proposals and other criteria such as cost, deliverability and timing.

8. CAMBRIDGE SOUTH EAST TRANSPORT STUDY

The Chairman reported apologies from the Chair of the Cambridge South East Transport Study Local Liaison Forum (LLF) who was unable to attend the meeting, but had asked for a statement to be read out on his behalf. It was noted that the LLF had met on 12 September 2018 and received a presentation on the paper being discussed by the Joint Assembly and Executive Board. The LLF had:

- Noted the outcomes of the consultation held early in 2018; and
- Broadly supported the further work proposed in relation to Strategy 1, but there had been some support for continuing to consider light rail and it had been noted

that if Strategy 1 proved to be impractical, Strategies 2 and 3 remained on the table.

The GCP Transport Director presented the report which set out the GCP's vision and objectives for public transport, the Cambridge South East Transport Study business case development work and the results of the public consultation undertaken at the end of 2017.

The GCP's Transport Portfolio Holder informed the Joint Assembly that the LLF meetings which he had attended had expressed their general support for the proposals.

Regarding Haverhill to Linton, the Joint Assembly was made aware that West Suffolk aspired to enhance its highways capacity in that area, which did not align with the aspirations of the GCP to reduce congestion in Cambridge while highways enhancement would facilitate congestion reaching Cambridge more quickly. The GCP was working with West Suffolk on this.

The Joint Assembly discussed the report and made the following points:

- Councillor Williams pointed out the need to serve the key employment areas. He felt that Strategy 1 did not serve the Babraham Research Campus and stopped short of Granta Park. The proposed routing for Strategy 1 needed to set out how it would serve these sites to ensure the vision and objectives for public transport were achieved.
- Councillor Massey queried the safety considerations of segregated routes.
- Andy Williams suggested that the relationship between the Sanger Institute, Babraham Research Campus and Granta Park needed to be understood. He also queried how far the existing Babraham park and ride site would impact on the business case for having a transport scheme further out of the city.
- Christopher Walkinshaw observed that the report did not set out the need for the capacity for the mass transit scheme. He urged that this be picked up. The proposals also needed to bear in mind the wider area and national highway network given that not everyone travelling from Haverhill wanted to come into Cambridge.
- Helen Valentine suggested that the overall benefit of the proposals had been underestimated. Cambridge South Station had not been taken into account and, if delivered, would increase the benefits significantly.
- Councillor Bick supported the positive direction of the proposals and welcomed the opportunity to tackle the environmental challenges and to enhance and improve the environment. He commented on the need to serve the key residential centres outside the city, such as Sawston, Stapleford and Great Shelford, as well as the key employment centres.
- Councillor Kavanagh observed that 25% of consultation respondents had not provided their postcodes. It was suggested that this may be due to a lobbying group responding to the consultation. In response, the GCP Chief Executive assured the Joint Assembly that the research team had sophisticated manual and automated technology to ensure the response to the public consultation was balanced and not just from one area.
- The GCP's Transport Portfolio Holder reported that County Councillor Kevin Cuffley was concerned that the villages of Sawston and Shelford were not forgotten in the development of the infrastructure. Councillor Bates emphasised the importance of keeping local members such as County Councillor Cuffley, involved.

In response to the Joint Assembly's comments, the Transport Director made the following points:

- The employment sites were the key drivers for usage of the proposed schemes, however he acknowledged the residential centres were also important.
- Not all users would travel along the corridor from end to end, so access points were key for local services to ensure they had access to the infrastructure.
- Technology had moved on since the creation of the Guided Busway. This scheme would be less intrusive. Safe walking and cycling was integral and was being designed into the project.
- The route was indicative and discussions had taken place with most of the landowners. Regular dialogue was taking place with Cambridge Past Present and Future (CPPF) to address its concerns.
- The future location of park and ride sites was important on this route. The aim was to get people onto public transport as soon as possible on their journeys in order to achieve traffic and environmental improvements. Park and ride sites therefore needed to be further out of the city. Their relationship to employment site locations was important along this route.
- Cambridge South Station could not be included in the proposals as this was not yet a committed scheme.

The Chairman summarised the conclusions of the debate noting that the Joint Assembly had broadly welcomed the proposals and supported their progression. However there had been concern about the reach of Strategy 1 to Babraham Research Campus, Granta Park and the Wellcome Genome Campus, as well as to the villages in the vicinity; Sawston, Stapleford and Great Shelford in particular. The opportunities for potential environmental enhancement offered by the scheme had been supported. There was a strong desire for Cambridge South Station to move up the agenda so that it could be incorporated into the business case.

9. WEST OF CAMBRIDGE PACKAGE (M11/JUNCTION 11 PARK AND RIDE)

The Joint Assembly considered the report which provided an update on the progress with the West of Cambridge package. It was noted that significant enhancement of park and ride capacity would still be needed in this location even if improvements were made to parking facilities at Foxton and Whittlesford.

The Joint Assembly was updated on work undertaken with the Combined Authority to ensure alignment of proposals and to avoid duplication. The report reflected and acknowledged the Combined Authority's view that park and ride should be temporary in nature as other planned enhancements would in future remove the need for park and ride. It was hoped that park and ride could be enhanced by extending the existing park and ride site at Trumpington, or through provision of a new site to the west of the M11. The agreement of the Executive Board would be sought to go out to public consultation on the best location for the park and ride facility. It would also be necessary to consider the need for further interventions along Trumpington Road to enhance bus reliability into the city centre. This would support extending park and ride provision.

In discussing the report, Joint Assembly members made the following points:

- Councillor Williams queried why detailed origin and destination data on existing users of Trumpington park and ride was not in the report. This data was needed in order to support the assumptions being made.
- The Combined Authority's desire for park and ride sites to be temporary in nature was acknowledged by Councillor Williams, however he pointed out that the sites would need to go through the planning process and this would require them to have proper road surfaces, lighting, drainage and facilities.
- Councillor Williams pointed out that Whittlesford was on the Liverpool Street line,

which was not the best line for getting into London. In response, the Chairperson informed the Joint Assembly that the West Anglia Taskforce was working towards four tracking a short section of the Liverpool Street line to enhance capacity, which would enable better access to London.

- Councillor Williams commented that Whittlesford station might be attractive to people using Stansted Airport and suggested that if there was a park and ride facility at Whittlesford, people using the airport might park at the park and ride site as this was cheaper than parking at the airport.
- Councillor Williams expressed concern that parking for users of Cambridge South Station was not mentioned in the report. It was important to bear in mind that many people travelled from villages such as Fulbourn to Cambridge North Station as they found this more convenient than using Cambridge Station. The same would happen when Cambridge South Station opened. As Cambridge South Station would be served by the busway and rapid transit system, people would also use this station to access Cambridge City.
- Councillor Sollom echoed Councillor Williams' earlier comments regarding the apparent lack of data analysis and the need to see quantification of the statements made in the report. He also pointed out that there were no other measures for mode shift along the A10 and queried whether this was to be abandoned, or whether there were other schemes that could be brought forward for that route.
- Councillor Topping informed the Joint Assembly that Harston Parish Council had expressed concern regarding the growth of the employment centres and the potential increase in rat running through villages if there were not proper transport solutions. Councillor Topping was concerned that another park and ride site in South Cambridgeshire would do little to tackle the congestion in Harston and surrounding areas. He felt that there needed to be more in the plans that benefitted the residents and villages of South Cambridgeshire.
- Councillor Massey queried the impact and timespan of the disruption that would be caused to the road network when the park and ride capacity was enhanced.
- Dr Wells felt the report lacked context, was missing detail around the transport network and how commuter destinations would be reached from the park and ride. The GCP needed to be able to tell a more compelling story of a 10 year evolving strategy for creating a strategic interchange network.
- Helen Valentine recognised that while provision of additional park and ride facilities was not a perfect solution, there was an urgent need to respond to the significant increase in private car trips, particularly given the additional traffic that would be generated with the next phase of the Biomedical Campus. She acknowledged the need for provision of further park and ride facilities but was not supportive of an extension to the existing site at Trumpington which was likely to be an expensive option and to give rise to objections. She expressed support for a new park and ride site off the M11 but emphasised that significant improvement measures along Trumpington Road were also essential.
- Councillor Bick agreed that the site off the M11 appeared to be the most appropriate location for additional park and ride capacity and indicated his support for the direction of the proposals in the report. However, he suggested that independent public transport access was needed across the M11, potentially using the agricultural bridge to the north of the junction. He sought clarification on where the public transport would come out having come over the M11 towards the city and whether buses might come out at the Trumpington Meadows Park. He urged that the benefits of the park should not be eroded. He hoped that the detail around this would come out in the public consultation. Councillor Bick also referred to the need for more details on the nature of the proposed traffic interventions along Trumpington Road.
- Andy Williams pointed out that Trumpington Road park and ride was already at capacity yet an additional 4000 employees would be coming to the Biomedical

Campus in due course, all of whom would need somewhere to park. He commented that Astrazeneca's interest in a park and ride at Hauxton was due to its links to the strategic road network.

- Councillor Kavanagh suggested that a new park and ride facility could be used to accommodate coaches bringing day trip tourists to the city and school mini buses.
- Councillor Kavanagh thought the option of increasing capacity at the existing Trumpington Road park and ride site should not be pursued and supported a further review of the option for a new park and ride site west of the M11.
- Councillor Bates informed the Joint Assembly that a study had been carried out which looked at the coaches coming into Cambridge and future demand, linking to tourism. The GCP Transport Director could provide further information on this study to anyone interested.
- Councillor Bates referred to the need to engage both with businesses and residents in Trumpington Road regarding potential improvement measures along the road.
- Councillor Wilson pointed out that the GCP was concerned about the temporary nature of park and ride sites and suggested that people might be discouraged from using the sites if facilities, such as lighting, were not adequate.
- Councillor Baigent commented that as residents' parking came on stream, those people who had previously parked in those areas might look to the park and ride sites for parking instead. He also emphasised the need for park and ride sites to have appropriate facilities such as toilets and suggested that there was scope for developing transport hubs providing services in the future.
- Councillor Massey pointed out that hospital staff parking was being reduced by a third from October 2018, which would increase the pressure on the capacity of the Trumpington park and ride site.
- Councillor Topping made a plea that if proposals for a Foxton park and ride and crossing were to come forward for consideration by the GCP Joint Assembly and Executive Board in December 2018, there should be early engagement with the residents of Foxton.

The GCP Transport Director made the following comments in response to the Joint Assembly:

- A lot of data had been gathered to justify the assumptions made in the report.
- To bring forward park and ride sites, the GCP would need to work with planning authorities to ensure that facilities were sufficient to meet planning requirements.
- The cost of developing the bridge access option would be considerable and unlikely to be compatible with the Combined Authority's desire for temporary solutions. Further discussions would be needed with the Combined Authority and planning authority.
- It was acknowledged that residents' parking increased the pressure on existing park and ride capacity.
- The proposals outlined in the report were not designed to fix the problems on the A10. Work was ongoing at Foxton, which would be presented to the Executive Board in December 2018.
- Cambridge South Station was not a committed scheme.
- Proposals had not reached the level of planning to determine the extent of disruption likely to be caused. The challenge of extending an existing park and ride site was that capacity would have to be taken out while the site was extended.
- Traffic light improvements would not be enough to deliver the improvements that were needed on Trumpington Road. It would be important to work with communities to develop solutions for the road.

The Chairperson summarised the discussion, noting that there had been a mixed reaction from the Joint Assembly to the proposals. Members had been concerned that the Trumpington Road park and ride site was already at capacity and that this situation would

be exacerbated by the further development of the Biomedical Campus. Members had generally concurred that additional park and ride capacity was needed urgently. However, Joint Assembly Members had challenged what was meant by “temporary” park and ride sites. The extent to which the proposed schemes contributed to mode shift had been question and the need to secure more benefits for residents of South Cambridgeshire had been highlighted. Reference had been made to the need for the GCP to be able to tell a more compelling story of a 10 year evolving strategy for creating a strategic interchange network. Finally, the need for improvements to Trumpington Road and to engage with residents on the proposals had been emphasised.

10. BETTER PUBLIC TRANSPORT PROJECT - WATERBEACH TO SCIENCE PARK AND EAST CAMBRIDGE CORRIDORS

The GCP Transport Director presented the report which set out the emerging recommendations for the better public transport project for Waterbeach to the Science Park and East Cambridge corridors. These corridors had been identified by the Executive Board as a priority project for developing public transport, walking and cycling improvements that were linked to the development of proposals for a regional rapid mass transit solution.

The Joint Assembly discussed the report and commented as follows:

- Christopher Walkinshaw urged that consideration be given to those accessing Cambridge from outside the GCP area.
- Andy Williams strongly endorsed the suggestion to look at the areas which had not yet been looked at. There had been a lot of focus on the west and south west but there was a need to consider the east, south east and the north of the area. The Transport Director assured the Joint Assembly that the boundary issue was recognised and this emphasised the need to work closely with the Combined Authority.
- Councillor Williams pointed out that the boundary on the east side of the GCP's area was very close to the city. Places on the east of the boundary such as Bottisham were as close to the city as places on the west such as Bourn, but were not covered by the GCP. He commented on the need for closer working with East Cambridgeshire District Council, pointing out that housing development in the District would generate commuter trips into Cambridge from the east side of the GCP's boundary. The GCP had very limited input into these developments. There was a need to liaise with both East Cambridgeshire and Forest Heath District Councils to ensure a more joined up transport strategy.
- The Chairperson commented that according to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review (CPIER) report, East Cambridgeshire had demonstrated the fastest recent growth in Cambridgeshire.
- Councillor Wilson urged the GCP to take into account and engage with the communities along the A10. She referred to Cottenham, Willingham and Rampton in particular as they would be contributing to the congestion in the absence of any improvements to local public transport in this area. She pointed out that along this route many people had no alternatives than to use cars.
- Councillor Kavanagh commented that the report did not refer to the planned greenways route from Waterbeach to Cambridge which could accommodate cyclists.
- Councillor Bates requested that Joint Assembly Members be provided with links to existing reports about the work that had been undertaken on the A10 linking Kings Lynn to Cambridge and Ely to Cambridge. It was suggested that Joint Assembly Members should also be provided with a link to the report submitted to the County Council's Economy and Environment Committee on the Waterbeach planning application.

In summing up the debate, the Chairperson referred to the general support expressed by the Joint Assembly for the emerging recommendations in the report. Members had however commented on the need for closer working with East Cambridgeshire District Council in the light of the increased housing development in the District and the resultant impact in terms of generating commuter trips into the GCP's area. Additionally there had been a call for the GCP to take into account the communities along routes that would be contributing to congestion in the absence of improvements to public transport, such as Cottenham, Willingham and Rampton, where residents had no alternative to using cars.

11. PLACE BASED PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY

The GCP Communications Manager presented a report which provided an update on proposals to refresh and improve the GCP's Communications and Engagement Strategy. This built on experience to date, external reviews, including that carried out by The Consultation Institute, stakeholder feedback and in analysing the geography of multiple additional transport schemes. It proposed moving to a place based engagement model.

Joint Assembly members made the following comments:

- Councillor Massey expressed support for the proposals. She welcomed the use of social media and encouraged the use of better and more informative posters.
- Councillor Wilson informed the Joint Assembly that some communities, such as Cottenham for example, had no understanding of what the GCP schemes meant for their community. She pointed out that there had been engagement on rural travel hubs with Oakington residents but not with Cottenham residents. More engagement was needed with feeder villages such as Cottenham.
- Councillor Bick supported the proposals in the report but urged that engagement should not just tell communities what was happening; their input was needed to inform proposals. The Joint Assembly needed the views of the broader community to inform its discussions.
- Councillor Sollom pointed out the importance of community generated proposals and emphasised that communities needed to be brought along with the GCP.
- Councillor Topping pointed out the importance of keeping the public engaged in the work of the GCP.
- Helen Valentine, while agreeing with the proposals, raised concern about whether area meetings considering multiple topics at a meeting would get to the same level of detail that LLFs had and which had been beneficial to GCP projects to date. She also referred to the proposal on page 77 for LLF reports to be submitted to the Executive Board alongside Joint Assembly feedback and raised concern that input from LLFs might skip the Joint Assembly and go straight to the Executive Board. She felt it was important that the Joint Assembly was informed by the views of the LLFs when considering proposals.
- Jo Sainsbury supported the direction of the draft engagement calendar but raised concern that most consultation appeared to focus on transport. Communities also needed to be engaged in the wider aspects of the work of the GCP such as housing and skills.
- Councillor Wotherspoon highlighted the concern that LLFs had not had enough time to consider papers before Joint Assembly and Executive Board meetings. He supported them having more time to consider and discuss proposals and to form a community response to these.

The Communications Manager responded to the points raised by the Joint Assembly:

- With regard to the comments on lack of engagement with Cottenham, confirmed that she would make contact with Cottenham Parish Council.
- She clarified that the intention was not to bypass the Joint Assembly and take reports straight to the Executive Board, rather that a more formal report setting out LLF feedback would be submitted to the Board.
- The GCP did not want to lose local knowledge and local detail. Workshops on the detail of the schemes would supplement broader community meetings.
- The GCP would be launching an email update and alert system that members of the public could sign up to via the GCP website, to keep them informed.

The Chairperson noted that there was general support for proposals to refresh the GCP's Communications and Engagement Strategy. The Joint Assembly had highlighted the importance of keeping the community engaged with the work of the GCP and had indicated general support for the concept of broader place based community meetings. However members were keen that the level of detail that had been achieved through LLFs looking at schemes should not be lost and had flagged up a need to engage communities in the wider aspects of the GCP's work, such as housing and skills.

The Chairperson noted that Beth Durham, Communications Manager, would shortly be leaving the GCP and, on behalf of the Joint Assembly, thanked Beth for her work on behalf of the GCP.

12. QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

County Councillor Susan van de Ven was invited to speak as local member on the A10 Melbourn to Royston cycle link. She updated the Joint Assembly on the progress made on the A10 cycle link, 75% of which was complete. The final segment to be completed would connect Melbourn to Royston. This would require a bridge with footings in two different counties. Hertfordshire County Council had funded a feasibility study and North Hertfordshire District Council had committed £55,000 towards funding the final section of the route. Big businesses were also contributing financially to this. The current position was very positive and Councillor van de Ven hoped that the GCP could push for the final stretch of the cycle route to be completed. The Chairman thanked Councillor van de Ven for her update.

The GCP's Head of Strategy and Programme presented the report which updated the Joint Assembly on progress across the GCP programme.

In response to a question asked at the last meeting. The Joint Assembly was informed that smart panels had been situated in the following locations:

- The West Cambridge site (two panels)
- Shire Hall
- Cowley Road
- South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne
- AstraZeneca
- Anglia Ruskin University.

It was also intended to provide a smart panel at Cambridge North Station and discussions were taking place with the station's operator about this.

Responding to a second question asked at the last meeting, the Joint Assembly was informed that data was not collected on the average age of apprentices. Information was collected by age ranges; 16-18, 19-24 and over 25s. In the previous financial year, 46.6%

of apprentices were in the over 25s age category; 29% were in the 19-24 category and 24% were aged 16-18. It was noted that the GCP should be in a position to appoint an apprenticeships service provider in November 2018.

Joint Assembly members made the following comments:

- Councillor Massey informed officers that she had tried to use a wayfinder outside Cambridge Station but had been unable to find an option to change the language from English and had found that the map did not work. The direction sign was inaccurate and could mislead those that were not familiar with Cambridge. She referred to directional stones on the pavement in Peterborough and wondered if this was an option for Cambridge.
- Councillor Topping requested that further information be provided in the Transport Delivery Overview on the more immediate projects rather than detail about projects due in 2023.
- Regarding the Transport Delivery Overview, Heather Richards suggested it would be useful to see the projected design, construction and completion periods of the projects. This would enable the Joint Assembly to talk about the potential impact of projects and to enable a better view of the bigger picture.
- Councillor Bick queried what else was happening on skills in addition to the apprenticeships tender. In response to this the Joint Assembly was informed that the GCP was considering what else could be done on skills with the budget available, in addition to the apprenticeships service.
- Dr Wells suggested it would be useful to outline the forecast total cost of projects and forecast cash flow.

The Joint Assembly noted the progress across the GCP programme and the update on the A10 Melbourn to Royston Cycle Link and the Arbury Road Cross City Cycling Scheme. In summing up, the Chairperson highlighted Members' requests for more information around projected design/construction/completion periods of projects and detail around immediate projects rather than those due in 2023.

13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Joint Assembly noted the next meeting would take place at 2.00 pm on Thursday 15 November 2018. It was anticipated that there could be considerable public interest in the items on the agenda and with that in mind it was agreed that the meeting would be held at South Cambridgeshire Hall in Cambourne.

The Meeting ended at 4.15 p.m.

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

No	Questioner	Question	Response
Page 1	Councillor Dr Jocelynn Scutt, Chair of Milton Road Local Liaison Forum (LLF)	LLFs – Information and Communication	
		Milton Road Local Liaison Forum has worked closely with Milton Road Project officers and consultants. The expertise of members – particularly Milton Road Residents' Association and Hurst Park Estate Residents Association representatives and their members – has been key in ensuring that the Project is optimally shaped to meet Greater Cambridge Partnership objectives consistent with Milton Road's (and surrounding streets') character as a residential area, in addition to Milton Road's being a major link between Cambridge City and outer-lying areas.	The Partnership is committed to engaging with local communities and recognises the valuable contribution local residents can make to the development of a scheme, bringing as they do detailed knowledge of the area in which they live. The GCP is particularly mindful of the constructive engagement work that took place with the Milton Road LLF in respect of the Milton Road project and believes that the designs now being consulted on are testament to the extent of community contribution, as Cllr Scutt points out.
		The Consultation stage has now been reached as publicised by Twitter and on YouTube.	
		Members of the LLF, Residents Associations and residents have contacted me as chair of the LLF expressing concern that they learned of the Consultation's commencement through the Twitter and YouTube publicity rather than by direct communication from the Greater Cambridge Partnership and that they had no role in the consultation format.	The reference to GCP's intention to provide a greater lead-in time 'to adequately plan and secure stakeholder buy-in prior to public consultation' relates to the scheme as a whole, not to consultation exercises. To this end GCP officers and the consultants spent significant time holding community meetings and workshops with members of the LLF to finesse the final scheme design.
		The GPC Engagement and LLF Review states an intention to provide a greater lead-in time 'to adequately plan and secure stakeholder buy-in [sic] prior to public consultation'. This has not resulted in engagement with Milton Road LLF and particularly Residents' Associations. This appears to have been subjugated to 'focus groups', the 'Community Sounding Board' and 'key stakeholders'. Surely the latter must include the LLF and Residents' Associations – at least their representatives on LLFs?	In preparing consultation materials the GCP will, as far as is practicable, sense check these for presentation and legibility only, not for any changes to the design. This will include discussion with LLF Chairs/Vice Chairs and other external stakeholders prior to publication if we are able to. But it is not practicable to seek to agree consultation materials with everyone who might be interested beforehand – the GCP has to own that process and take responsibility for it. The opportunity to engage more widely and obtain feedback comes from the consultation process itself.
		As LLF Chair I was notified by the GCP of the imminent release of the Milton Road Project consultation document. However, it was in its final form, no consultation occurring prior to this and not with the LLF or Residents Associations.	In terms of the reference to the community sounding board, these discussions took place with the best of intentions in order to have a wider reach of engagement with a range of different groups in the area. The sounding board has no official role in the consultation or any decision making remit. It was simply a way of bringing together a range of people with different views. The GCP's intention is to enhance engagement activity, not to constrain it and is very aware of the excellent contribution which the LLF has made to the development of the Milton Road Scheme.
		Does the Greater Cambridge Partnership recognise that this is not best practice and ensure that in the future – to ensure 'buy-in' – such planning includes as 'key stakeholders' LLFs and particularly Residents' Associations or at least their members on LLFs?	

This page is left blank intentionally.