

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

- Date: Friday 7th March 2014
- Time: 1.00 p.m. to 2.10 p.m.
- Place: Kreis Viersen Room, Shire Hall, Cambridge
- Present: Peterborough City Councillors
P Hiller (Chairman) and N North
- Cambridgeshire County Councillors
D Jenkins and M McGuire
- Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership (GCGPEP)
Grahame Nix
- Officers: Peterborough City Council – Simon Machen and Mark Speed
Rutland County Council – Dave Brown
Cambridgeshire County Council – Dearbhla Lawson, Bob Menzies, Jeremy Smith and Gwyneth Barton (Democratic Services)
- Others: Simon Amor (Highways Agency)
Eric Cooper (Highways Agency)
- Apologies: Cllrs I Bates (Cambridgeshire) and M Pocock (Rutland)

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chairman welcomed members and officers. It was noted that as the Rutland member and substitute were unable to attend, the meeting was technically inquorate. However, the Rutland member, Councillor Pocock, telephoned shortly after the start of the meeting and confirmed that he had discussed the agenda with the Rutland officer, who would represent his views.

2. MINUTES AND ACTIONS OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 27th January 2014 were agreed as a correct record.

3. OUTLINE TRANSPORT PROGRAMME FOR RECOMMENDING FOR GCGPEP STRATEGIC ECONOMIC PLAN

Board members were invited to endorse the Transport Programme circulated with the agenda for inclusion by the GCGPEP in their Strategic Economic Plan (SEP). This would form the basis for the GCGPEP to negotiate a Growth Deal with Government for Local Growth Funding from 2015 to support economic growth across the GCGPEP area.

Board members had previously contributed to the development of the Transport Programme at their meetings on 4th December 2013 and 27th January 2014. They now made the following comments:

- **Feedback from Ministers** – Noted feedback from Grahame Nix on LEP colleagues' discussion with Ministers on 21st February 2014 of the draft SEP. A key issue would be

to convince Government of the deliverability of schemes, with a strong focus on 2015/16 spend. Government would be seeking strong emphasis on the two key criteria of jobs and housing and it might be necessary to strengthen the SEP on these points.

Board members commented on the challenge inherent in preparing a long-term joined-up strategy for growth and meeting the Government's call for 'shovel-ready' transport plans for 2015/16. It would be important to bring these two imperatives together effectively to achieve maximum benefit.

Board members noted that Ministers had encouraged LEP colleagues to share the draft Transport Programme with civil servants immediately after this meeting and to work proactively with them in finalising the GCGPEP submission.

- **Managing expectations** – Expressed concern that it would be important to manage expectations about the Transport Programme's content and to prioritise. Dearbhla Lawson noted that the Programme linked closely to local work to develop a Long-Term Transport Strategy for the County; this would include a live, prioritised action plan.
- **Travel patterns and technology** – Commented in relation to the second paragraph of the Programme's 'vision' on page 7 that key economic hubs in Cambridge, Alconbury and Peterborough should be well connected with the places listed and with each other as well. It was also suggested that greater emphasis should be placed on the practical implications of the proposals for people's travel arrangements in terms of journey patterns, travel times etc.

Grahame Nix noted that the SEP would be promoting strong links between the digital agenda and transport challenges. The GCGPEP would be working with the County Council on the Connecting Cambridgeshire project to encourage the use of smart technology to help people link up their journeys. Dearbhla Lawson noted that the Transport Strategy for Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire would also be promoting a smarter, more networked city.

- **Rail and air** – Commented in relation to paragraph 1.2 of the Programme on the need to improve access to airports, particularly the capacity and frequency of rail links to Stansted. Officers agreed to highlight this more strongly in the text and also to strengthen references to national projects such as the east-west rail link.

A comment was also made that the length of immigration queues could be off-putting to potential business users of Stansted could be off-putting to people considering flying into the airport for business. Grahame Nix noted that the GCGPEP was developing a good relationship with the Manchester Group, the operators of Stansted, who were focussed on improving the airport's service. Simon Machen noted that the Group was looking to fund additional border control staff itself, although it did not directly control the service. This was welcomed.

- **Route-Based Strategies** – Noted that the Highways Agency's Route-Based Strategies were currently out for consultation. It would be important to align these with the SEP.
- **Housing figures** – Noted that the Peterborough and other housing numbers in Figure 1 on page 2 would be refined prior to submission.

In conclusion it was resolved to:

Endorse the outline Transport Programme set out as Appendix 1 to the Board report, subject to any final amendments to be agreed with the Chairman and Lead Members, for recommendation to the LEP for inclusion in their Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Strategic Economic Plan, which was to be submitted to Government by the end of March 2014 for negotiating a Growth Deal for the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough area.

4. FUTURE ROLE AND REMIT AND DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR DISCUSSION

As requested at the previous meeting, Dearbhla Lawson presented a discussion paper on the future role and remit of this group and draft terms of reference. Board members were reminded that from July, Growth Deal funding would be channelled by Government via the LEP, not the Local Transport Board (LTB). Government did not have a view on the future role or continued existence of LTBs once the transition to the new arrangements was complete, but had suggested that this be determined locally. Officers emphasised that it would be important to ensure that local arrangements aligned geography, remit and functionality as effectively as possible. It was therefore proposed that the current group transition to become a sub-group of the LEP.

Responding to the report, Board members discussed the following issues:

- **Agreement to transition** – Agreed that the work of the LTB should come to an end and that the current group should transition to become a sub-group of the LEP.
- **Role of the new LEP sub-group** – Noted that the LEP Board would retain decision-making powers and would determine strategic priorities based on recommendations from the sub-group. The LEP Board was likely to want to adopt a high-level programme monitoring role, to enable it to provide evidence to Government of successful delivery, including delivering on value for money.

Board members noted that the role of the sub-group would depend in part on the nature of the Growth Deal to be agreed, which could involve specific arrangements relating to local authorities or to the LEP.

Grahame Nix suggested that a small number of LEP Board members should sit on the sub-group, possibly two, not necessarily with voting rights. The involvement of these Board members in the sub-group's discussions could be of assistance when the sub-group's recommendations were brought to the LEP Board. This suggestion was welcomed.

- **Members from overlapping LEP areas** – Discussed the possible inclusion of members from overlapping LEP areas on the sub-group. Concern was expressed that too great an increase in membership could result in the group becoming ineffective, or could apportion undue influence to local authorities on the periphery of the LEP area. One option might be to ask these authorities to join in an advisory role.

Grahame Nix emphasised that GCGPEP was already in dialogue with other LEPs such as New Anglia on overlapping transport schemes.

It was suggested and agreed that there should be an informal meeting between the LEPs and the transport authorities across the area as soon as possible, to work through

these issues. Dearbhla Lawson and Grahame Nix would draft and send out an invitation.

- **City Deal** – Noted that although the SEP and the City Deal involved separate bidding processes, current work on the City Deal was relevant. It was noted that the LEP would be represented on the Governance Board for the City Deal. The successor group to the Local Transport Board would need to link effectively to the City Deal where appropriate and so it was agreed that this linkage should be recognised in the new group's terms of reference.
- **Public or private meetings** – Discussed whether meetings of the LEP sub-group should be in public. Grahame Nix noted that meetings of the LEP Board were not open to the public, although its minutes were published. Current sub-groups of the LEP were not open to the public and were primarily advisory; however, people were invited to meetings and requests to attend were usually accepted. Grahame Nix suggested that the LEP Board was likely to want a similar arrangement for a LEP sub-group on transport.

Local authority members and officers felt strongly that meetings of a LEP sub-group making recommendations on the spending of public money on transport schemes should be held in public, unless there were specific commercial reasons for confidentiality. It was also suggested that there was a benefit in local transport authorities coming together to work on policy and strategy development, slightly apart from the work to prioritise schemes through the LEP, and that if this work continued, meetings on this should also be in public.

It was agreed that officers would seek legal advice to help resolve this point.

- **Next steps** – Agreed that an updated report on transitional arrangements should be prepared for the next meeting.

5. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

No items were raised.

6. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was agreed that the next meeting should be arranged for early May 2014.