



GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE BOARD

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Executive Board
Thursday 1st October 2020
2:05 p.m. – 4:50 p.m.

Present:

Members of the GCP Executive Board:

Councillor Roger Hickford (Chairperson)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Neil Gough	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Lewis Herbert	Cambridge City Council
Phil Allmendinger	University Representative
Claire Ruskin	Business Representative

Members of the GCP Joint Assembly in attendance:

Councillor Tim Bick (Chairperson)	Cambridge City Council
-----------------------------------	------------------------

Attending at the discretion of the Chairperson:

Mayor James Palmer	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority
--------------------	--

Officers:

Jo Baker	Project Manager (GCP)
Peter Blake	Transport Director (GCP)
Debbie Bondi	Project Manager Smart Cambridge (GCP)
Sarah Heywood	Strategic Finance Business Partner (CCC)
Niamh Matthews	Head of Strategy and Programme (GCP)
Nick Mills	Democratic Services Officer (CCC)
Rachel Stopard	Chief Executive (GCP)
Paul Van de Bulk	Project Manager (GCP)
Grant Weller	Project Manager (GCP)
Wilma Wilkie	Governance and Relationship Manager (GCP)

1. Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies for absence.

The Chairperson welcomed Councillor Neil Gough, who had replaced Councillor Aiden Van de Weyer as the South Cambridgeshire District Council representative on the Board. The Chairperson expressed thanks to Councillor Van de Weyer.

The Chairperson also welcomed Mayor James Palmer of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) He confirmed that he had exercised the discretion available to him to interpret Standing Orders and with the agreement of the other voting members of the Executive Board, suspend them if necessary, to invite Mayor Palmer to join the meeting in an informal non-voting capacity in recognition of the CPCA's role as the Strategic Transport Authority in the area.

In response, Mayor Palmer thanked the Chair for allowing him to attend the meeting, which he saw as an important step in improving joint working arrangements between the GCP and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA). He confirmed that the Business Board would shortly be nominating its representative to the GCP Board which would ensure close alignment between the objectives and plans of the City Deal and the Business Board. Referring to the Cambourne to Cambridge scheme, Mayor Palmer confirmed that details of the Combined Authority's alternative route would be reported to its Transport and Infrastructure Committee on 4th November 2020. This would enable details to be presented to the next GCP Executive Board in December. He emphasised that this was a situation that needed to be sorted out very quickly and he hoped the alternative route would provide a positive solution; one that was palatable, not just to the Combined Authority, the GCP and business community, but to the general public as well. He argued that joint working arrangements should exist on a political level, as well as an officer level, in order to ensure this and other schemes were properly aligned. His attendance at Board meetings would help achieve this and officers were already sharing more information than had previously been the case. He hoped that from now on arguments would take place in private and solutions made in public.

Executive Board members welcomed Mayor Palmer to the meeting and supported his call for improved joint working, noting that the 2017 Devolution Deal stated that the CPCA would work with the GCP and support it in delivering the objectives of the City Deal. Members noted the planned discussion on the Cambourne to Cambridge route and asked for this to include a demonstrable comparison of the two options so they could be properly assessed and a decision made, avoiding further delay.

2. Appointment of Vice-Chairperson

It was proposed by the Chairperson, seconded by Councillor Herbert and resolved that Councillor Gough be elected Vice-Chairperson of the GCP Executive Board for the remainder of the municipal year 2020/21.

3. Declarations of Interest

Phil Allmendinger declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to the proposal for funding to be allocated to the Centre for Business Research in the 'GCP Quarterly Progress Report' (agenda item 12) due to his employment at the University of Cambridge.

4. Joint Assembly Membership

The Executive Board received a report confirming details of nominations from the University of Cambridge to fill the vacancies on the Joint Assembly following the resignation of Jo Sainsbury and Dr John Wells.

The Executive Board resolved to:

Approve the appointment of Karen Kennedy and Lucy Scott as co-opted members of the Joint Assembly.

5. Minutes

The minutes of the previous Executive Board meeting, held on 25th June 2020, were agreed as a correct record and the Chairperson agreed to sign a copy when possible.

6. Public Questions

The Chairperson informed the Executive Board that two public questions had been accepted and that the questions would be taken at the start of the relevant agenda item, with details of the questions and a summary of the responses provided in Appendix A of the minutes.

It was noted that one question related to agenda item 8 (Greenways – Barton, Bottisham, Horningsea, Sawston and The Swaffhams) and one question related to agenda item 9 (Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to North East Cambridge).

7. Feedback from the Joint Assembly

The Executive Board received a report from the Chairperson of the GCP Joint Assembly, Councillor Tim Bick, which summarised the discussions from the Joint Assembly meeting held on 10th September 2020.

Drawing attention to the fact that the Joint Assembly had supported all the recommendations that would be presented to the Executive Board, the Chairperson of the Joint Assembly noted that particular enthusiasm had been expressed for the proposed measures related to skills and employment. He also welcomed that the wide range of points of detail, emphasis and suggestions that had been raised by the

Joint Assembly had been incorporated into the subsequent reports for the Executive Board.

8. Greenways – Barton, Bottisham, Horningsea, Sawston and The Swaffhams

A public question was invited from Lynda Warth (on behalf of the Cambridgeshire British Horse Society). The question and a summary of the response are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Transport Director presented the report, which provided an update on progress made in developing the Greenways network, outcomes from recent public consultations, and an outline of scheme details and budget proposals for the Barton, Bottisham, Horningsea, Sawston and Swaffhams Greenways. It was noted that final proposals would be presented in 2021 following the completion of the detailed design process, throughout which there would be continuous engagement with local stakeholders.

It was observed that the Joint Assembly had expressed concerns about the timelines for the routes and the Transport Director confirmed that delivery times of the various schemes would be reduced whenever it was possible to do so. Such adjustments were dependent on whether it proved necessary to secure Compulsory Purchase Orders (CPOs). Land agents were being appointed to oversee such matters with the aim being to reach an agreement with land owners, given that an amicable solution would represent the most productive and efficient outcome. However, it was acknowledged that CPOs would be used if required.

The Executive Board resolved to:

- (a) Note the progress made in developing the Greenways, working with local communities and stakeholders to date and the outcome of public consultations;
- (b) Approve the scheme proposals and note an outline budget of £10m for the Barton Greenway;
- (c) Approve the scheme proposals and note an outline budget of £5m for the Bottisham Greenway;
- (d) Approve the scheme proposals and note an outline budget of £2.5m for the Horningsea Greenway;
- (e) Approve the scheme proposals and note an outline budget of £9m for the Sawston Greenway;
- (f) Approve the scheme proposals and note an outline budget of £4.5m for the Swaffhams Greenway;
- (g) Approve £1.25m for the development of detailed scheme design in preparation for construction in 2020/21;

- (h) Approve the negotiation of the land and rights required for the delivery of the scheme; and
- (i) Note the commitment to ongoing dialogue with local stakeholders as part of the scheme development process.

9. Better Public Transport – Waterbeach to North East Cambridge

A public question was invited from Paul Bearpark. The question and a summary of the response are provided at Appendix A of the minutes.

The Transport Director presented the report, which provided an update on progress of the Waterbeach to North East Cambridge project, including feedback from pre-engagement with stakeholders and outline proposals for a series of integrated packages which would be the subject of consultation and further analysis, if supported by the Executive Board. Early stakeholder engagement had established widespread recognition of the need for improvements to public transport in the corridor, while the formal consultation and design stage would help establish the scheme's requirements and in turn help to develop the strategic case. He highlighted the importance of public consultations in being able to identify and understand the interactions that would occur along the whole route. Noting that the Joint Assembly had emphasised the need to consider the project in a wider context of connectivity with other schemes, he informed the Executive Board that discussions were being held with the CPCA on how it would complement planned improvements to the A10, as well as delivery of the CAM network.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Observed that the corridor represented an area in which multiple developments were ongoing at the same time, including proposals to improve the A10 and develop the CAM network, and it was therefore suggested that data should continue to be collected across the area in order to predict future traffic levels.
- Expressed concern that communities along the route would not benefit fully from the scheme if they were not factored in throughout the development and consideration of the options. One member noted that although the main report detailed various complementary opportunities that could arise as a result of the project, such opportunities had not been included in section 6.4.3 of the Options Appraisal Report, which listed key differential factors between the options. The Transport Director acknowledged the concerns, which he indicated had also been raised by the Joint Assembly, and noted that early consultations allowed for such issues to be considered early on in development of the project. Previous projects had resulted in public transport proposals, such as the development of bus and cycling maps, and he agreed that this needed to be demonstrated throughout the process. However, he noted that the process was required to follow rules set out by the Department for Transport.

- Suggested that consultations with affected residents and businesses should be intensified in areas that would suffer from a particular impact.
- Emphasised the importance of identifying the best route to cross the A14, with the A10 roundabout considered insufficient to deal with the area's growth.
- Argued that improvements to public transport should be made before other schemes that would not encourage modal shift, such as the potential dualling of the A10, although it was noted that various options were being considered for improvements to the A10. It was also acknowledged that different kinds of traffic would use the different transport routes available, which made it important to ensure that capacity was not over-provided on either of the routes to the detriment of the other.
- Welcomed the extensive contributions made by the Joint Assembly in consideration of the proposals.

The Executive Board resolved to:

- (a) Note the outcome of pre-engagement activities (July/August 2020) and emerging stakeholder feedback;
- (b) Approve the Options Appraisal Report as the basis to formally consult on the proposed route options for a segregated public transport route; and
- (c) Note the list of shorter term interventions that have been identified for further assessment, as set out in Section 7 of Appendix 1 of the report.

10. Better Public Transport – Cambridge Eastern Access Project

The Transport Director presented the report, which provided an update on progress of the Cambridge Eastern Access project, including feedback from pre-engagement with stakeholders and outline proposals for a series of integrated packages which would be the subject of consultation and further analysis, if supported by the Executive Board. While pre-engagement had established significant consensus on the necessity to resolve congestion issues, there were differences in opinion on how this could be achieved, as demonstrated in section 5.9 of the report. It was noted that the project sought to support the delivery of the CAM network and promote sustainable public transport, cycling and walking options. A set of shorter term interventions were included in the proposals, although it was emphasised that they would be further developed if considered appropriate following public consultation.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Observed that continuation of the Mill Road bridge closure received both support and opposition, as indicated in section 5.9 of the report, and it was queried how such a conflict could be resolved. It was also argued that roads such as Mill Road and Coldham's Lane, were coexistent and were equally affected by gridlock in surrounding areas of the city. The Transport Director informed members that the

County Council would be considering the continuation of the Mill Road bridge closure, although he acknowledged that issues raised during the pre-engagement needed to be considered as part of the formal consultation stage in order to incorporate a wider context throughout the scheme's development.

- Suggested that roads in the western section of the scheme that were heavily congested during peak hours were severely constrained, hampering the potential for off-road public transport routes. The Transport Director acknowledged the limitations of Newmarket Road, although he suggested that a short term solution could improve its traffic flow and, subject to consultation, the GCP would aim to implement such measures over the following 12-24 months while simultaneously developing the overall scheme.
- Members emphasised that green spaces, such as Coldham's Common or Stourbridge Common, should not be used for such routes, while it was noted that the eastern section of the scheme benefited from a greater amount of space and therefore a wider range of options could be considered than in the urban section.
- Expressed support for the consideration of improvements to rail connectivity in the east of the city, due to the current service being unable to provide sufficient capacity.
- Confirmed that the scheme would integrate with the Local Plan, with the CAM also planning to provide an alternative travel choice that would help alleviate congestion, although it was acknowledged that the CAM network was a long-term project.
- Argued that the Newmarket Road Park and Ride site would be a more attractive option for car users if it was located closer to the A14. The Transport Director acknowledged the suggestion and confirmed that technical work to date had identified such a move as a relatively quick win, although further investigation and consultation was required.
- Observed that traffic congestion issues were returning to previous levels following a drop during the early stages of the pandemic lockdown.

The Executive Board resolved to:

- (a) Note the outcome of pre-engagement activities (July/August 2020) and emerging stakeholder feedback;
- (b) Approve the Options Appraisal Report as the basis to formally consult on the proposed route options for a segregated public transport route; and
- (c) Agree that packages of options should be presented in two phases:
 - Phase 1: improvements to the Newmarket Road corridor to address existing problems and issues relating to committed development.

- Phase 2: longer term strategy to address the requirements of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan and delivery of CAM Phase 1.

11. Covid-19 – Skills and Employment

The Head of Strategy and Programme presented a report which included proposals for a package of measures to address the medium to long term impacts that Covid-19 was likely to have on the local skills base and labour market. Attention was drawn to section 5 of the report, which set out the key issues and considerations that were identified in joint research carried out with partners and providers. Four broad themes had been developed as key areas for intervention: supporting young people into employment, support for adults who need to retrain, preventing NEETS (Not in Education, Employment or Training), and ensuring employers could find the skills and talent they needed locally. A core set of activities had been further established to support these themes, as set out in section 6.2 of the report.

Building on the work currently being carried out by Form the Future and Cambridge Regional College, it was proposed to procure a new GCP skills contract that would double the current effort through a more targeted approach. A four-year contract running to the end of the current Gateway period in 2025 would provide continuity and sustainability at an estimated cost of £2m. It was noted that in order to avoid a gap in provision when the current contract expired at the end of March 2021, the procurement process would need to commence as soon as possible.

Members were informed that recommendation (b) in the report contained an error and the proposed start date for the new contract was April 2021, not April 2020.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Welcomed the comprehensive list of proposed actions, although argued that the working group should consider refining it into a shorter list, perhaps grouping some of the actions together. The Head of Strategy and Programme clarified that the procurement process would streamline the list of activities.
- Queried how the aim for activities to target areas of deprivation, as expressed in section 6.3 of the report, would be possible given that some of the activities were not specific to such areas. The Head of Strategy and Programme informed the Executive Board that the suggestion to target areas of deprivation had been by the Joint Assembly and was based on evidence that showed such areas would suffer more from the impacts of Covid-19. She acknowledged that it was yet to be established how to target these areas specifically, although it had been included in the procurement exercise to determine how providers would address the issue and support these communities. It was suggested that placing it as the first action on the list would attribute it maximum importance.
- Suggested that £500k represented a reasonable budget for the project, although it was also pointed out that providers should provide clear plans for how they would implement and carry out the work. It was confirmed that suppliers would be required to provide a clear set of principles before being accepted, as well as

identifying key performance indicators that they would monitor throughout period of the contract.

- Welcomed a focus on supporting businesses in the proposed activities, noting that they needed assistance to overcome the impacts on training and apprenticeships.
- Expressed support for a four-year contract, which would allow relationships to be established and strengthened throughout its duration, although it was suggested that the situation could change during that period and therefore the contract should be kept under review during this time.
- Asked that a report be presented to the Board in March 2021 to provide an update on the outcome of the procurement process.

The Executive Board resolved to:

- (a) Approve the scope for a new skills work package that seeks to directly address the likely impact of Covid-19 on the local skills base and labour market; and
- (b) Approve the proposal to procure a new Skills contract, over four years, from April 2021, worth up to £2m.

12. GCP Quarterly Progress Report

The Head of Strategy and Programme presented a report to the Executive Board which provided an update on progress across the GCP programme and which also sought endorsement for funding for four separate proposals:

- The provision of two new careers advisors for a 12-month period through the Greater Cambridge Apprenticeship Service;
- The delivery of skills interventions led by the New Meaning Foundation;
- The progression to the scoping stage of the ongoing project to increase the capacity of the energy grid in the Greater Cambridge area; and
- The Centre for Business Research at the University of Cambridge to provide three sets of quarterly analyses of the strength of the Greater Cambridge economy in light of the current economic crisis, as set out in section 19.

Members were informed that the Skills Working Group had requested short-term opportunities to accompany the more long-term approach in tackling the impacts of Covid-19, which had led to the first proposal, which was for two additional careers advisors in the Greater Cambridge area for an initial 12-month period at an approximate cost of £75k. A further proposal had been received from the New Meaning Foundation to develop a training programme and training centre in Greater Cambridge to support people at high risk of not being able to enter the training market. Immediate training of 12 trainees would cost £76k, while £105k was requested to set up the training centre, leading to a combined total of £181k.

The constrained capacity of the local power network continued to represent a barrier to growth in the Greater Cambridge area and initial research over the past two years

had developed various scenarios which now required to progress to a more detailed stage, as proposed and laid out in section 18 of the report, with an indicative business case also attached as appendix 4 to the report. The request for approximately £100k additional funding would allow the project to move forward on locally-orientated interventions and it was acknowledged that further research was required on issues including the regulatory framework, planning implications, land acquisitions, ownership and legal considerations.

Following on from the development of a Local Economic Recovery Strategy with the CPCA and other local authorities, along with other research carried out by organisations such as Hatch Regeneris, it had been identified that there was a lack of Greater Cambridge-specific sectorial data available. A proposal had been discussed with the Centre for Business Research (CBR) to produce a quarterly analysis that would allow the GCP to deliver interventions in a more focused and targeted way. The Head of Strategy and Programme noted that the data would be shared with other partners and therefore the £36k cost of the research could potentially be shared as well.

While discussing the report, the Executive Board:

- Welcomed the proposal to collate Greater Cambridge-specific sectorial data but sought clarification on how the data would then be used, as while the GCP would be focussing on the skills and transport impacts, other partners would be looking at the impacts on businesses and how to provide support to them. The Head of Strategy and Programme explained that being as informed as possible on the state of the local economy would allow for the design of an implementation plan to be the most effective and targeted, and she undertook to provide greater detail on the impacts of the data collation after the first presentation had been received. The Chief Executive observed that the ongoing pandemic had drastically affected the nature of the business environment and if the GCP was unable to identify or understand such impacts, it would be unable to address them and provide the necessary interventions.
- Expressed concern over the viability and cost-per-job rate of the proposal submitted by the New Meaning Foundation, although it was suggested that this would be lower once the training centre had been established and a higher number of trainees were involved. The Executive Board was assured due diligence was always carried out on any company before it received funding and it was noted that the start-up funding that had been requested was to construct a physical space from which the training could be provided. The subsequent production and sale of units created by the centre would ensure that the project became self-sustaining.
- Supported the proposal to progress developing the capacity of the local power network but expressed concern that it was the responsibility of power companies to carry out such work. While noting that the market was regulated, it was clarified that before technical and specification work was carried out it would be established whether there was a framework that enabled the GCP to make a return on its investment. Although a profit could not be made on the investment, it was suggested if the initial expenditure could be recovered, higher levels of funding could be considered.

The Executive Board resolved to:

- (a) Note progress across the GCP programme;
- (b) Approve expenditure of £75k, to enable the provision of two new careers advisors for a 12-month period through the Greater Cambridge Apprenticeship Service, as set out in section 9;
- (c) Approve expenditure of £181k to enable delivery of skills interventions led by the New Meaning Foundation, as set out in section 10;
- (d) Approve expenditure of up to £100k, to progress to the scoping stage of the ongoing project to increase the capacity of the energy grid in the Greater Cambridge area, as set out in section 18; and
- (e) Approve a proposal to allocate up to £36k to fund the Centre for Business Research at the University of Cambridge to provide three sets of quarterly analyses of the strength of the Greater Cambridge economy in light of the current economic crisis, as set out in section 19.

13. Date of Next Meeting

The Executive Board noted that the next meeting would be held at 4:00 p.m. on Thursday 10th December 2020.

Chairperson
10th December 2020

Appendix A – 1st October 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Responses

No*	Questioner	Question	Answer
1	Lynda Warth County Access & Bridleways Officer – Cambridgeshire British Horse Society	<p>Agenda Item 8: Greenway Schemes</p> <p>Reference in the meeting documents is made to the ‘cycle path’ through the Wing Development - this is to be an NMU route available to pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians. The same applies to the Quy to Lode well used ‘cycle path’. These are NMU routes not cycle paths.</p> <p>Prior to approval of the Greenways proposals today, will the GCP please confirm that ‘shared use’ is as defined in all the Greenway consultation documents – available to all three vulnerable road users – pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians and ensure that the routes are delivered as such? This applies to all the routes being considered at this meeting.</p> <p>Will the Board ensure that equestrians are not excluded from any sections unless a genuine safe alternative route is available to them (defaulting to the legally available option of the busy highway, already identified as unsafe for cyclists, does not count as ‘safe’)?</p> <p>Where Pedestrian / Cycle Only routes are to be created / improved, will the Board please require that the Safety Audit must assess the impact on the safety of equestrians created by the schemes?</p>	<p>The Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) has committed to the principle of inclusion for <u>all non-motorised users</u> along Greenway routes. Some specific challenges and constraints remain in providing for equestrians. The GCP have recognised these challenges and we have made a commitment that Greenways will not disadvantage existing users.</p> <p>Where a section of path is unable to accommodate equestrians for any reason a genuine safe alternative route will be sought.</p> <p>Identification of deliverable provision with safe access for horse riders has been an objective in the development and consultation stages of the Greenways project thus far and we acknowledge. We look forward to a continuing dialogue as we enter into the design phase of the project.</p> <p>Safety audits will assess the impact on the safety of equestrians.</p>

Appendix A – 1st October 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Responses

2	Paul Bearpark	<p>Agenda Item 9: Better Public Transport - Waterbeach to North East Cambridge</p> <p>I live on Cambridge Road, Waterbeach, close to 3 of the 4 route proposals through Waterbeach village. I am the founder of Waterbeach Cycling Campaign and I led the development of the transport policies for Waterbeach Neighbourhood Plan. I strongly support improved active travel and public transport provision. However, I am concerned that the narrow range of options, through Waterbeach, with 3 of the 4 options taking the same alignment through the Cambridge Rd/Glebe Rd pinchpoint, and insufficient weight given to the difficulties of delivering a route through here, will lead to difficulties delivering the entire route.</p> <p>These difficulties are only mentioned in Appendix E pg 142 of the board paper which states” <i>Space is constrained here so any transitway alignment may either <u>require housing demolition</u> or would encroach on allotments. Passes close to houses and may face opposition from residents.</i>”</p> <p>The Project Manager has told me that no demolition is intended but it is difficult to see how a route through this pinchpoint is possible without demolition or significant impact on residents.</p> <p>Q1 Can the GCP provide a route through Waterbeach village that will not involve demolition of property or result in significant opposition from residents?</p> <p>Q2 Why are there not more route options through Waterbeach village? For example, a route along</p>	<p>Q1 The search area that is shown to pass through Waterbeach village is intended to outline the appropriate area to consider if (and only if) it is determined that a segregated route should also serve Waterbeach village. A key question that we will be asking during the consultation will seek to determine the level of support for passing such a route through Waterbeach village. We fully understand that passing a route through this area would bring it very close to residential property boundaries and potentially impact on the allotments.</p> <p>Q2 In the early stages of assessment, we have looked at both a search area that follows the line of the railway, and a search area that follows the A10 alignment. Both have similar issues in terms of lack of space and impact on existing residential property and neither offer the advantage of passing close to the centre of the village. Another option we have considered is using the existing high street, but if a segregated route is required, (to support the Combined Authority’s announced requirements for the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro) then this would also be disruptive for other reasons.</p>
---	---------------	--	--

Appendix A – 1st October 2020 Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Public Questions and Responses

		<p>Waterbeach High St was rejected very early in the process. Concerns about reliability could be addressed through consideration of parking controls and modal filters at suitable points. This would have the additional benefit of making the centre of the village more attractive for walking and cycling and better serve the east of the village and new town.</p> <p>Q3 Will a detailed map showing houses at risk of demolition or significantly affected be available during the consultation?</p>	<p>Q3 We are not considering detailed route proposals at this very early stage of the project - we have not undertaken the appropriate investigations, or heard back from any formal consultation yet, which will help determine the future approach. At this stage we are assessing the very broad picture of where this route should begin and end and therefore we do not propose to include a detailed map within the consultation materials.</p>
--	--	--	---