

**GREATER CAMBRIDGE GREATER PETERBOROUGH
SHADOW LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY BOARD MEETING**

Date: Wednesday 15th October 2014

Time: 9.00am – 10.05am

Place: Bourges Room, Peterborough Town Hall

Present: Peterborough City Councillors
P Hiller (Chairman) and N North

Cambridgeshire County Councillors
D Jenkins and M McGuire

Rutland County Council
M Pocock

Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership (GCGPEP)
Neil Darwin

Officers: Peterborough City Council –Mark Speed
Rutland County Council – Dave Brown
Cambridgeshire County Council – Dearbhla Lawson and Dawn Cave

Others: Simon Amor (Highways Agency)

Apologies: Cllrs I Bates and E Cearns (Cambridgeshire); Graham Hughes and Adrian Cannard.

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chairman welcomed members and officers.

2. MINUTES AND ACTIONS OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 7th March 2014 were agreed as a correct record.

3. LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK

The Board received an information report on the Assurance Framework, which was required to demonstrate that the Shadow Board has robust arrangements for both governance and scheme prioritisation. It was noted that the Assurance Framework had been signed off by the DfT, but was likely to change as the role of the Local Transport Body evolved to align more with the LEP.

4. MONITORING UPDATE FOR LTB MAJOR SCHEMES

The Board received an update on the progress of the prioritised major schemes which had secured funding from the Local Transport Body:

- Ely Southern Bypass: this scheme had been approved by Cambridgeshire County Council's Planning Committee in September. Construction was scheduled to commence in August 2015. The estimated cost had increased to £35M, mainly due to construction inflation since the cost had originally been estimated in 2012. The scheme had been awarded a total of £6M LTB funding over the next two years;
- King's Dyke Level Crossing: an options assessment was currently being progressed, and was on target for a consultation on a single option to begin in January 2015, with approvals and construction scheduled to commence at the end of 2015;
- Soham Station: work was ongoing with Network Rail, as this scheme was dependent on double tracking work. This was in Network Rail's programme to be completed by 2019, but it was hoped that it could be progressed earlier so that the Soham Station scheme could be progressed. The scheme was critically important for the growth of Soham.

A Member observed that authorities' major schemes were often very dependent on Network Rail, and it was suggested that Network Rail could be invited to the LTB Board meetings. This point was acknowledged by officers, and Neil Darwin commented that this issue was common to all LEPs, and that authorities were key in communicating with Network Rail. Dearbhla updated the Board on a recent meeting with Network Rail and Members from both the County Council and East Cambridgeshire District Council to progress issues on Soham Station where progress on developing plans was dependant on Network Rail finalising plans for double tracking the line in the first instance. It was also noted that one of the aims that was highlighted in this areas Strategic Economic Plan was to ask Government for greater alignment on investment plans and priorities across partner organisations.

Reviewing the Peterborough City Council schemes that had been awarded LTB funding, Members noted:

- A47/A15 Junction 20 roundabout improvements: Peterborough City Council was working with the Highways Agency on this scheme which was on target for initial design to be completed by 31/12/14, and the detailed design to be completed by 30/05/15;
- Bourges Boulevard: this project was on site and due for completion by the end of March 2015. The City Council had used corporate borrowing to enable the scheme to be delivered early, and the LTB funding would pay back that capital. A new Waitrose supermarket was opening next to Peterborough railway station on 29/10/14, and a pedestrian crossing would be in place for that opening. Works would then be stopped on the run up to Christmas, and would then continue in the new year. Councillor Hiller commented that although there had been some issues with the scheme, the good forward planning and communications were to be commended. Mark Speed explained that communications had been timely and honest, and whilst there had been challenges during the first week, the scheme was progressing well.

Disappointingly, Peterborough's ITS bid received no funding, but a revised/refreshed bid based on a package for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough sustainable future transport/traffic management would be put forward as a future bid.

5. GROWTH DEAL FUNDING AND PROCESS UPDATE AND PROPOSED TRANSPORT PROGRAMME

Members received a report on the outcome of the first round of Local Growth Deal Funding for the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership (GCGPEP) area.

Members were reminded that £14.1M had been awarded in 2013, and progress on those schemes had been outlined in the previous item. However, that funding was 33% less than indicative levels as Government had been keen to ensure funding was available for competitive bidding in a Local Growth Fund to support economic growth in LEP areas. The GCGPEP's Strategic Economic Plan had subsequently been developed to support the vision and strategic objectives for the growth of the area, and help secure funding from this Local Growth Fund pot. In July, a Local Growth Fund award totalling £17.1M for 2015/16, and £20.4M for projects in 2016/17. This includes funding for two new innovation Centres, skills and the Agritech programme. In terms of investment in transport, Growth Deal funding had been allocated to the following transport interventions:

- £5M for A605 (King's Dyke) (£2.5m in 15/16 and £2.5m in 16/17)
- £3M for A47 Junction 20 (including £2.5m in 2015/16)
- £10.5M for Bourges Boulevard (including £3m in 2015/16)

Growth Deal funding had not been allocated to the A142 Ely Southern Bypass for 2015/16, as at the time of bidding, planning permission had not been granted. Officers were now exploring the potential to secure Growth Deal funding for this project as part of the Round 2 bid for Government funding where a bid for up to £16m is expected to be submitted to support delivery of this scheme.

Government had also announced a provisional allocation of £9M for the St Neots to Cambridge Public Transport project, subject to a strong business case, with the most likely focus for improvements on the Madingley to Cambridge area which regularly experiences delays at peak hours.

The overall amount of funding secured for the GCGPEP area was disappointing, and feedback had been sought from government. The feedback suggested that there had been some strong bids, and these should be refreshed and resubmitted for future rounds of funding, but also that there needed to be a stronger and clearer narrative regarding how the schemes support the SEP vision and the growth and development of the area.

Members noted proposals for schemes that would meet the criteria and be put forward for Round Two of the Growth Deal and that this process was now well underway with the Local Authorities and LEP. Rutland had separately submitted some priority proposals. The prioritised list of recommendations would be presented to the Local Authority Leaders on 16/10/14 and the LEP Board on 27/10/14. Once the LEP Board had approved the final prioritised list that would be submitted to Government. It was envisaged that the outcomes would be announced at some point between the Autumn Statement and March.

Neil advised that analysis of the outcome of the funding suggested that the GCGPEP area needed a stronger identity, with greater emphasis on the importance of the wider south east, and that this area was the fastest growing part of the country. Bids also needed to be submitted as one, combined list, and not set out by individual authority, to demonstrate real joint working, which was at the heart of the government's emphasis of 'governance'. The GCGP had also analysed those LEPs that had performed particularly well in attracting growth funding, and observed that Norfolk and Suffolk (who had been particularly successful), had a strong core of six MPs working together and promoting bids. There was also an issue in identifying the LEP area strongly in bid documentation e.g. clear maps early in the bid documentation. The LEP was working to engage MPs with mixed success/outcome – Member support would be crucial in ensuring this MP engagement, although it was suggested that it was not necessary to have *all* MPs on board, but a core group who could promote the need for infrastructure schemes. It was also noted that the

settlements awarded appeared to be related in part to population, and then depending on the strength of the SEP, that allocations were increased or decreased.

In discussion, Members:

- agreed that dialogue with MPs was critical;
- stressed the need for simplified communications – whilst the government process was complex, the communications and submissions did not need to be, and Members stressed the need for clarity, consistency and context;
- stressed the importance of the role of Members in the process – it appeared that SEP2 lacked input from Members. Neil responded that this was mainly due to the time pressures, and acknowledged the need for greater Member input in the longer term, especially in prioritising single lists of prioritised bids;
- commented that the ‘long list’ of potential schemes (currently 45 schemes) led to so much wasted resource. Officers responded that the ‘long lists’ were already there in the form of Peterborough’s Integrated Development Programme, and the authorities respective Long Term Transport Strategies, etc, which had already been through the respective democratic processes.
- commented that Members needed to be reassured that the projects being submitted measured up in terms of value for money, deliverability and leverage;
- commented on the lack of joined up thinking, particularly between partner agencies, such as local authorities and the Highways Agency e.g. the A1/A47 junction. A wider, strategic view was essential. Simon Amor of the Highways Agency advised that there was a pinchpoint scheme starting at that junction in January 2015. Another Member commented that there needed to be greater working between authorities when schemes were on authority boundaries e.g. A605/Great Haddon scheme.

Members noted the report and agreed the following actions:

- Neil Darwin to feedback to the LTB on the outcome of the Leaders’ meeting on 16/10/14;
- Officers to investigate commissioning a technical assessment of the list of prioritised bids to ensure that there was evidence regarding the performance of all schemes proposed to support future consideration and prioritisation .

6. PROPOSED TRANSITION FROM LTB TO LEP TRANSPORT GROUP

A report was presented, providing initial thoughts on how the Shadow Local Transport Body would transform into a formal panel of the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership, and fit in with the government’s accountability framework. Draft Terms of Reference, building on the existing Terms of Reference, had also been developed and was appended to the report.

Members agreed to change the name of the body to the *Local Enterprise Partnership Transport Panel*. Members discussed retaining the existing membership, but possibly inviting a business leader to join (and possibly to chair the Panel), and also the importance of strengthening links with adjacent authorities. Cambridgeshire County Council would continue to act as accountable body, although further clarity was sought on what changes there might be with the proposed LEP Accountability Framework. It was agreed that the Panel should be as seamless as possible.

Members:

- Agreed in principle to transitioning to LEP Transport Panel but that further clarity was needed regarding the specific remit and Terms of Reference for this group ahead of agreeing Terms of Reference
- noted that the LEP Board would be meeting on 27/10/14, and it would be helpful to have from the LEP Leaders a clear statement on the purpose of the Local Enterprise Partnership Transport Panel
- Noted that the Terms of Reference needed some further development and that these would need to be checked by respective authorities' legal teams before they signed up to them;
- highlighted that the political system at Cambridgeshire had changed to a Committee system, without a specific scrutiny function.
- expressed concern that there were no resources, but e.g. there were major requirements that remained especially for the Accountable Body such as the expectation for independent scrutiny and that the Section 151 officer would sign off on value for money, etc – there was a resource issue that needed to be recognised and clarified in light of the changed requirements with LEP Transport Panel instead of LTB.;
- noted there was no time imperative – the LEP was advising government that the transition was being worked on, but there was no specific time constraint;
- welcomed the proposed wording under 'Role' (2.7) in the draft Terms of Reference which stated *“Work collaboratively with the Greater Cambridge City Deal Combined Authority on development and delivery of transport schemes that affect the City Deal area”*;
- stressed the importance of coherence, clarity and context, in communications and submissions;
- stressed the importance of working together, and noted the difficulties resulting from disjointed messages from government, which could result in time being wasted;

The Shadow Board noted the report, and agreed that:

- LEP to provide feedback from the Board on Transport Panel Remit and a revised Terms of Reference would be reissued for the Member authorities to check/clear the wording of the Draft Terms of Reference with their respective legal teams;
- all authorities to feedback their comments on the Draft Terms of Reference to Adrian Cannard to enable this item to be reported to a future meeting of this group

5. NEXT STEPS AND FUTURE MEETINGS

It was agreed that there would be a meeting of the Shadow Local Transport Body Board in mid-December. **ACTION: Dawn.**