



GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP

Growing and sharing prosperity

Delivering our City Deal

GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE BOARD

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board
Wednesday, 26 July 2017 at 10.00 a.m.

PRESENT:

Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board:

Professor Phil Allmendinger	University of Cambridge
Councillor Ian Bates	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Francis Burkitt	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Lewis Herbert	Cambridge City Council

Officers/advisors:

Rachel Stopard	Greater Cambridge Partnership
Chris Tunstall	Greater Cambridge Partnership
Niamh Matthews	Greater Cambridge Partnership
Tanya Sheridan	Greater Cambridge Partnership
Noelle Godfrey	Connecting Cambridgeshire
Sarah Heywood	Cambridgeshire County Council
Mike Davies	Cycling Projects Team Leader
Wilma Wilkie	South Cambridgeshire District Council

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON

Councillor Francis Burkitt was **ELECTED** Chairperson of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board.

2. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRPERSON

Councillor Lewis Herbert was **ELECTED** Vice Chairperson of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board.

3. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence had been received from Mark Reeve.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following declarations of interest were made:

- Professor Allmendinger declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to agenda item 10 [Milton Road and Histon Road Improvements] as a resident of Gilbert Road. He also referred to those items set out in his published register of interests.

- Councillor Ian Bates indicated he had no interests to declare, other than those set out in his published register of interests.
- Councillor Lewis Herbert declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to item 13 [Cross City Cycling] as he was a resident of Hills Road and the report contained proposals to introduce a Traffic Regulation Order in that area. He also referred to other matters referred to in his published Register of Interests.
- Councilor Francis Burkitt referred to his declaration made at the meeting on 13th October 2016; which he intended to repeat as it was the beginning of a new civic year, but did not intend to repeat in future. His Register of Interests was lodged with South Cambridgeshire District Council and was available for viewing on its website. He had no other matters to declare, had not predetermined on any matter and intended to participate in the discussion on all agenda items. Councillor Burkitt was of the view, however, that it was good practice to remind people of the following items which he, the Legal Officer and the Chief Executive felt were 'interests' that would not disbar him from participating in discussions, including that on the Cambourne to Cambridge busway scheme:
 - he was a District Councillor for Coton and Madingley, villages through which that busway may or may not go and therefore knew many people in those villages;
 - when the Cambourne to Cambridge public consultation was launched, and in his capacity as a District Councillor, he coordinated and published a response to the public consultation that was branded as CambridgeBOLD. At that time he was a Member of the City Deal Joint Assembly, which was an advisory body with no decision-making powers. When he became a Board Member, with decision-making powers, he ceased doing any CambridgeBOLD work, and the initiative lapsed at that time and effectively ceased to exist, except that it remained on public record as one of the consultation responses;
 - he was a Member of Cambridge Past, Present and Future, was a patron and had been a Board Member for four years. This organisation owned the Coton Countryside Reserve and, separately, some of the field in Coton adjacent to Cambridge Road that stretched up the hill;
 - he had been at Trinity College Cambridge and had sat on its Finance Committee, with the College owning Moor Barns Farm in Madingley;
 - he and his employer had undertaken work as a debt advisor to the University and certain colleges. In 2012 his employer advised the University on a £350 million bond issue and in 2013 it advised 17 colleges on a £150 million debt private placement, for which the firm received fees. These transactions were in the public domain and he was part of the team providing this advice. The firm had no retainer, or ongoing relationship or work with the University or colleges, or any expectation of future work; and
 - he was born in Cambridge and had lived there on and off for most of his life, so he naturally knew lots of people who lived along the Cambourne to Cambridge corridor.

5. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 8th March 2017 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairperson.

6. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

The Chairperson informed the Executive Board that 25 public questions had been submitted, 22 of which would be taken at the meeting under agenda items 9, 10, 12, 13 and 15. He reported that, in line with Standing Orders and the public questions protocol, he had exercised Chairperson's discretion and would, on this occasion, only accept questions which related to items on the agenda and where the questioner was able to attend the meeting. This meant 3 questions would not be received at the meeting, but those concerned would receive a written response. One question had been submitted previously to the Joint Assembly and would not receive another response. Given the number of questions received, questioners had been asked to limit their contribution to one minute. A number of local Member requests to speak had been received and these would also be taken at the start of the relevant agenda item.

The Chairperson noted that some of the questions submitted exceeded the 300 word limit. He had not refused questions on that basis but gave notice he would in future be enforcing this, except in exceptional circumstances.

7. PETITIONS

The Chairperson reported that this item had been included on the agenda in error, as petitions were referred to the Joint Assembly.

8. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE JOINT ASSEMBLY

The Chairperson reported that unfortunately neither the Chairperson or Vice Chairperson of the Joint Assembly were able to attend the meeting, but referred to the report setting out decisions made at the meeting of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly held on Wednesday 19th July 2017. Reference would be made to the Joint Assembly's decisions at the relevant agenda items.

9. RAPID MASS TRANSPORT STRATEGIC OPTIONS APPRAISAL

The Executive Board considered a report seeking approval to proceed with a Strategic Options Appraisal into rapid, mass transport options for Cambridge City and the surrounding travel to work area in conjunction with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority.

The Chairperson reported that the Joint Assembly had supported the proposal but had suggested amendments to the recommendations, which had been agreed unanimously and are show in italics below:

- a) Commission a *high quality, independent* strategic options appraisal study into rapid, mass transport options for Cambridge City and the surrounding travel to work area in conjunction with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority *to deliver by November 2017; and*
- b) Agree a total budget allocation of £150,000 in 2017/18 for the delivery of the strategic options appraisal study.

The Chairperson reported that Councillor Rod Cantrill had asked to speak on this item as local member and invited him comment on the proposals. Councillor Cantrill referred to his question, which had been submitted in advance of the meeting and included in the list of public questions set out as Appendix A to the minutes and indicated he had no further comments to add.

At this stage in the proceedings the Chairperson invited Roger Tomlinson to ask his question, which had been submitted in line with the provisions of Standing Orders. He explained that a response to the questions asked would be covered in the officer presentation on the report. Details of the questions and answers are set out in Appendix A to the minutes.

The Interim Transport Director explained that it was proposed to appoint a consultant to provide expert independent advice on the most appropriate form of rapid, mass transit for Cambridge City and the surrounding travel to work area. Work would involve a strategic options appraisal of a range of underground and over ground rapid transport modes, including light rail, monorail, bus rapid transit and affordable very rapid transport. This would enable the GCP Executive Board and Combined Authority to determine the most appropriate form of rapid, mass transit to meet Greater Cambridge's future transport needs. The cost was estimated to be in the region of £150,000, half of which was expected to be met by the Combined Authority. The cost to the GCP would therefore be approximately £75,000. [Later in the meeting it was confirmed that the Combined Authority, which was also meeting that morning, had approved the proposal and agreed to fund half of the cost.]

The Executive Board was invited to consider and comment upon the proposals, taking into account feedback from the Joint Assembly and questions from a local Member and the public and officer responses. The response to questions of clarification and main points of discussion are summarised below:

- In response to a question from Councillor Bates, it was confirmed that the work would be completed in time for the report to be presented to the November meeting of the Executive Board.
- With reference to the map on page 18 of the agenda pack, the Chairperson asked for clarification of the area to be covered by the proposed study. The Interim Transport Director confirmed that the options appraisal would look at what was most appropriate for Cambridge and would not at this stage look at any particular mode of transport. It would also look wider than just Cambridge itself and would incorporate the wider travel to work area, which went beyond the Greater Cambridge area. Particular routes would be the subject of further reports.
- In response to a question from the Chairperson it was confirmed that the proposed options appraisal would cover all of the potential solutions listed in paragraph 3.1 of the brief [page 18 of the agenda pack]. The Interim Transport Director confirmed that the consultants would be asked to provide an independent assessment of anything and everything that they felt would suit a historic area such as Cambridge.
- The Chairperson also asked for further information on the proposed procurement process. It was confirmed that normal, well established procedures of the elected authorities would be followed. Consultants would also be asked to identify any connection with schemes, individuals or companies in the area. In response to a related question from Councillor Herbert, it was confirmed there would be a single lead officer responsible for this work. This would be a matter for the GCP and Combined Authority to agree and details had yet to be confirmed.
- With reference to the proposed project board, referred to in paragraph 7 of the brief [page 21 of the agenda pack] it was confirmed that its composition was subject to

confirmation, but was likely to involve the Chairperson of the GCP Executive Board, the GCP Portfolio Holder for Transport, the Mayor, the Combined Authority Portfolio Holder for Transport and possibly the Chief Executives of the two organisations.

- With reference to the major development site adjacent to the A141 in St Ives identified on the map on page 18 of the agenda pack, Councillor Bates explained that this site was not being recommended for development as part of Huntingdonshire District Council's Local Plan, which had recently been issued for consultation.
- In response to a question from Councillor Herbert it was confirmed that this was a two zone study and the brief referred to an inner and outer hinterland. Councillor Herbert suggested this was not immediately apparent from the map on page 18 of the agenda pack.
- Councillor Herbert asked for and received an assurance that there would be very clear references to and clarity about the synergy and integration with rail, taking into account the potential investments in rail within this geography.
- Commenting on the proposal, Councillor Herbert drew attention to the fact that the GCP had already discussing a study similar to this because Tranche 2 needed to include a radical look at different options. This would need to be an evidence based analysis and he was happy with the proposed amendment from the Joint Assembly and supported the suggestion that there should be no prejudgment of the outcome of the study. In response to the questions raised, he was not convinced that there was a case to be made for a delay to the Cambourne to Cambridge busway project, but this could be considered as part of the discussion on this item later on in the meeting and in the context of input from the Local Liaison Forum (LLF). With reference to the question about the neutrality of the consultants, Councillor Herbert explained that clearly he would expect this to be the case. He hoped that the proposed timetable would allow sufficient opportunity to pursue other issues about the fundability and deliverability of some of the potential options.
- Councillor Bates highlighted the importance of ensuring any study was independent and confirmed he was content with the assurances given by officers. He was also supportive of the amendments proposed by the Joint Assembly.
- Professor Allmendinger supported the comments made by other Executive Board members. With reference to Councillor Cantrill's question about clarity on the way forward, he did not accept that there was lack of clarity and emphasised the importance of distinguishing between routes and the modes of transport to go on those routes. He was of the opinion that it was important to continue with the evaluation of various routes while this study took place. He asked that the study result in a range of different approaches to transport in Cambridge over quite a long period, some of which would be implemented and then be superseded by an alternative solution. It was important to adopt an approach that incorporated interim solutions that allowed for evolution towards a longer term solution. The Chairperson supported this approach and highlighted the fact that this was about delivery both now and in the future.
- The Chairperson also expressed his support for the proposal and confirmed the importance of options being grounded in deliverability and affordability. He

reported that Mark Reeve, who was unable to attend the meeting, had confirmed that the Local Enterprise Partnership supported the recommendations as amended by the Joint Assembly.

The Executive Board **AGREED** unanimously:

- a) To commission a *high quality, independent* strategic options appraisal study into rapid, mass transport options for Cambridge City and the surrounding travel to work area in conjunction with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority to *deliver by November 2017; and*
- b) A total budget allocation of £150,000 in 2017/18 for the delivery of the strategic options appraisal study.

Amendment to officer recommendations shown in italic text.

10. **MILTON ROAD AND HISTON ROAD: BUS, CYCLING AND WALKING IMPROVEMENTS**

The Executive Board considered a report on future delivery priorities and project timelines for the Milton Road and Histon Road projects.

It was noted that the Joint Assembly had agreed to support the recommendations but with the addition of a further recommendation as set out below:

- h) Supplement development of this scheme with further consideration of means of achieving modal shift to public transport.*

This had been passed with nine members voting on favour, none against and four abstentions.

The Chairperson invited Councillor Damien Tunnacliffe to read out the following statement from Councillor Ian Manning:

I cannot support the Milton Road scheme as presented and neither should the board.

The original objections and controversy around the scheme came from the removal of trees. Despite repeated attempts at clarity we still do not have precise information on what replacement trees we can expect.

The consultants have repeatedly failed to model the effect of walking and cycling trips on traffic levels & therefore are unable to take this into account into the design. The greater Cambridge partnership should not just be going with the UK "industry standard" but should be demanding a higher standard appropriate to Cambridge.

The inability to consider Dutch Style roundabouts and lack of imagination around junction design are further reasons to reject this scheme.

New York style trialing should be built into the project from this early stage, but despite repeated support for this concept at the LLF and local meetings, it STILL doesn't appear.

There are enough City Deal schemes going forward, this one should not be given the go ahead at this stage.

Please make sure it is noted that I support NOT banning parking 24/7 outside the Hairdresser and Fish and Chip shop on Green End Road.

Although I'm no longer the local member as the Divisions changed in May, I was during the scheme development and it was me that originally proposed the entire scheme via S106 feasibility study.

The Chairperson invited Councillor Jocelyne Scutt, Chairperson of the Milton Road Local Liaison Forum (LLF) to presented feedback on the Forum's views on these proposals. She referred to pages 38-45 of the agenda pack which set out the resolutions agreed by the Forum and the officer responses. Councillor Scutt paid tribute to the work of the LLF, residents and officers who had put a huge amount of time and effort into engaging in the debate on the proposals.

Councillor Scutt commented upon the recommendations being presented to the Executive Board and suggested adding the words '*bearing in mind resolution (d)*' to the beginning of recommendation (c). She also suggested the deletion of the word 'process' from the end of resolutions (d) and (e). Councillor Scutt clarified that she had not been formally delegated to propose these amendments on behalf of the LLF, but was making these suggestions as its Chairperson.

The Chairperson in responding to Councillor Scutt's comments paid tribute to the work of the LLF and the constructive way they had contributed to the process and in making progress towards a mutually satisfactory solution. He also commended Councillor Scutt for her work in leading the work of the LLF. Other Executive Board members endorsed the Chairperson's comments and each paid tribute to the work of the LLF and thanked all concerned for participating in the process and for the contributions made.

At this stage in the proceedings the Chairperson invited members of the public to ask questions relating to this item, which had been submitted in line with the provisions of Standing Orders. He explained that a response to the questions asked would be covered in the officer presentation on the report. Details of the questions and answers are set out in Appendix A to the minutes.

The Interim Transport Director in presenting the proposals stressed the outcome of what was being proposed was designed for 2031, taking into account predicted growth. This was the start of a process and at this stage approval was being sought for the concept, not the final detailed design. He believed the proposals being presented to the Executive Board addressed many of the concerns raised by the LLF and local residents. Plans included ways of improving bus reliability, high quality cycling and pedestrian provision. The aim was also to achieve a high quality environment for local residents. He confirmed the LLF had been very instrumental in coming to the final concept and there would be further opportunity to work together to develop the final design proposals which would ultimately be presented to the Executive Board for approval and then be subject to public consultation.

The Executive Board noted that the Milton Road and Histon Road schemes supported the priority of achieving efficient and reliable movement between key existing and future housing and employment sites. This included new housing at Northstowe, Waterbeach and on the northern fringe of Cambridge and improved links with key employment sites, such as the Science Park and Cambridge North Station, benefitting residents, commuters

and businesses. The projects aimed to provide enhanced infrastructure for busses, to improve service reliability and journey times and encourage greater patronage. They also aimed to significantly improve the quality and safety of cycling and walking facilities, whilst also enhancing the quality of the streetscape and public realm areas and the environment. To avoid creating undue pressure on the road network in Cambridge, it was proposed that the projects would be constructed consecutively rather than concurrently. While both schemes were high priority, the Milton Road scheme had a stronger case for early delivery and would be progressed ahead of Histon Road. A detailed report on the Histon Road project would be presented to the November Executive Board meeting.

The Chairperson on behalf of the Executive Board welcomed the progress made, much of which he believed could be attributed to the hard work of the Interim Transport Director and he thanked him for his work.

The Executive Board was invited to consider and comment on the proposals, taking into account feedback from the Joint Assembly, comments from a local Member, feedback from the LLF, questions from the public and officer responses. The response to questions of clarification and main points of discussion are summarised below:

- Councillor Herbert referred to progressing to final design and asked if there was a list of items on which specific input from the LLF would be required. In response the Interim Transport Director confirmed that this included trees, verges, junction designs, which would be critical in looking at bus lane lengths, crossings and bus stops. Work would also focus on the public realm including siting of trees. This was by no means an exhaustive list as other matters would emerge as detailed design work progressed.
- Councillor Herbert referred to proposals for the Highworth Roundabout and options considered. The Interim Transport Director responded that there was a lot of space there, but the LLF and residents were quite clear they wanted to retain as much green there as possible. There was another option put forward that involved a T junction, that worked just as well, but that wasn't given as much support. The roundabout was the concept being proposed, but there would still be lots of opportunity to refine that more for pedestrians and cycling.
- Councillor Herbert referred to comments about the focus being on four wheeled vehicles and asked what was being done to ensure we modelled pedestrian movements and cycling movements. The Interim Transport Director confirmed that the ongoing modeling had already factored in all the signals with all the right timings for cyclists and pedestrians as this affected traffic flows. Allowance would also be made for some cyclists using the road and the potential impact this would have on traffic. While the Interim Transport Director accepted the premise that design was for four wheeled vehicles and above in terms of modelling, in terms of the proposed concept whilst there was provision for 190 extra meters of lane for those types of vehicles, there was 17,000 extra metres for two wheeled vehicles.
- In response to a question from the Chairperson, the Interim Transport Director explained the difference between the various models. Two models were being used, firstly the CRSM which was the Cambridge regional model which covered the whole of Cambridgeshire. By its very nature, this was a general model and did not provide fine detail. It covered the key links and had just been updated to take account of all of the development within the Local Plans and the impact of Cambridge North Station. Paramics was an industry standard model which takes detail out of the general model and modelled individual junctions along shorter

lengths of road.

- The Chairperson asked for clarification on how proposals for Mitcham's Corner linked with these proposals. In response, it was reported that when the original Milton Road/Histon Road scheme came forward it included Mitcham's Corner, but the Executive Board subsequently decided to take it out of the proposal. There had been discussions about this at the LLF and there was support to bring that back into the mix. The Combined Authority was also interested in bringing in a scheme there and officers were discussing how this might be achieved. It would not alter significantly what was being proposed but it would greatly add to it. The Chairperson responded that he supported this.
- With reference to cycle ways, the Chairperson highlighted the 1728 metres [over a mile] of extra cycle way being created. He referred to trees and reported that it had been confirmed that there were currently 139 trees on Milton Road, of which 11 were categorised as being dead or dying. The Chairperson had counted 189 'green dots' on the final concept plan of which 168 were on Milton Road and drew attention to the fact that the concept of providing more trees was being established. In response the Interim Transport Director replied he hoped that this would be confirmed in the final detailed designs. He explained that the trees identified in the final concept plan took account of driveways, but at this stage it was not possible to take account of what services ran underground. This would be looked at as part of the detailed design work.
- In response to a further question about next steps, it was confirmed that it was proposed to appoint a construction contractor to develop the detailed layout plan towards the end of 2017. Practice was to get contractors signed up early so that they could be involved in the process of producing the final scheme. Any appointment would be subject to the usual established local authority processes. The start of the scheme would not be until well into 2018, subject to appropriate approvals being secured from the Executive Board. With reference to the planned timescale for presenting detailed proposals it was confirmed that this was planned for March 2018.
- Professor Allmendinger expressed the view that these proposals were moving in the right direction and progressing from a general concept to a detailed scheme. He was heartened by the LLF's comments and this engagement had clearly been a very positive part of this process. He welcomed the potential re-inclusion of Mitcham's Corner as it made no sense to stop at the other side of Gilbert Road.
- Councillor Bates welcomed the proposed workshops and ongoing engagement with the LLF and local residents on developing the detailed design. In particular he supported further work on bus lanes. He drew attention to predicted growth, in particular a planning application for the development of over 6000 homes at Waterbeach currently being considered by South Cambridgeshire District Council. He also referred to studies on the A10 up to Ely and Kings Lynn which would look at the impact of growth on this and other counties. It would be important to see how these interlinked with the corridor into Cambridge.
- Councillor Bates referred to the LLF Chairperson's reference to park and ride charges and explained that he was currently working on removing the £1 charge from all park and ride sites in the county. He also supported comments made about Mitcham's Corner.

- Councillor Herbert recognised that considerable progress had been made, but there was still a lot to do. He highlighted the need to look at major junctions and the need to take into account safety, which was the subject of Mr Taylor's question. With reference to cost benefit analysis, he was of the opinion that the Executive Board should not be worried about putting extras into the scheme if this was responding to the views of a community who cared about the area.
- Councillor Herbert supported the amendment proposed by the Joint Assembly about modal shift and commented that the GCP should look at what was a fair and deliverable, equitable way of capping the number of cars that came into the City, which would include the number coming down this road. This was particularly relevant given plans to work in a more consensual way with the Combined Authority. It was important to accept that we faced a period of significant change and doing nothing was not an option.
- With reference to Mitcham's Corner, Councillor Herbert acknowledged that the City Council and the GCP would need to look at this. He suggested that once the work of the LLF on this project was done it be asked to have an initial discussion about this, in the context of the local action plan being proposed for that area.

The Executive Board **AGREED** unanimously to:

- a) Note the prioritisation of delivery of the Milton Road project ahead of the Histon Road scheme;
- b) Note the Milton Road Local Liaison Forum resolutions set out in Appendix B and agree the responses set out therein;
- c) Approve the 'Final Concept' design shown in Appendix D as a basis for detailed design work and the preparation of an interim business case to facilitate further public and statutory consultation;
- d) Note that wherever highway space permits, opportunities to adopt further aspects of the 'Do Optimum' design will be taken as part of the detailed design process;
- e) Support further engagement with the Milton Road LLF to help inform the detailed design process;
- f) Support discussions with relevant property owners to explore interest in a joint funding approach to potential streetscape and public realm improvements on land outside the public highway outside local shops along Milton Road;
- g) Note the revised project timelines shown in Appendix H and the next steps in project delivery set out in the report; and
- h) *Supplement development of this scheme with further consideration of means of achieving modal shift to public transport.*

Amendment to officer recommendations shown in italic text.

11. CITY DEAL QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

The Executive Board considered a report on progress across the GCP programme since March 2017. The report covered:

- The 2016/17 end of year financial outturn report;
- Financial monitoring to May 2017;
- A six-monthly report on Smart Cambridge;
- An update on the independent economic assessment panel;
- An update on the implementation of the Mouchel report recommendations; and
- The Executive Board forward plan of decisions.

The Chairperson drew attention to progress with accelerating housing delivery. 274 new homes were completed in 2016/17, which exceeded the Housing Development Agency target of 250. With reference to the delivery of additional affordable homes it was estimated that the target of completing 1,000 by 2031 would be met, as 792 had already been identified on the basis of decisions on specific planning applications. As potential Housing Portfolio Holder, Councillor Herbert welcomed progress made. He also drew attention to the Combined Authority's plan to set aside £150,000 for a strategic non-statutory Spatial Plan for the whole of Cambridgeshire. It was important to clarify how Greater Cambridge would fit within that. Clearly there was a lot of integration to do with this and also the Transport Strategy. Councillor Bates welcomed the Combined Authority's decision to put that amount of money into strategic planning, which he considered crucial going forward. Professor Allmendinger stated that what was not mentioned here was the work done by the task and finish group on the governance work. He had been involved in the group looking at housing which had examined what the GCP's role was and clarified there was a real role to play. This included helping unlock difficult sites and remove barriers to delivery, helping the market deliver affordable housing.

With reference to skills, good progress was being made against agreed targets, although use of SETUP had not been as successful as was hoped. Work was being done to see how to address this. The Chairperson drew attention to the need to look at progress with monitoring apprenticeships and suggested this was something the Skills Task and Finish Group should address urgently. Councillor Bates asked when a more detailed report on skills would be presented to the Joint Assembly and Board. He also referred to an LGA report on skills which had recently been published and asked that this be addressed as part of the next update. In response the Chairperson confirmed the six monthly report was due to come to the September meeting. He suggested that it may be appropriate for future reports to be submitted every three months.

The Programme Director for the Connecting Cambridgeshire and Smart Cambridgeshire Programme reported that overall progress was good and work was within budget. There had been a significant amount of activity over a relatively short period of time. She drew attention to the Intelligent City Platform, launched in March, which was being used to provide real time information for a variety of applications. Wide support across all sectors had enabled the programme to progress quickly. The MotionMap travel app, commissioned by GCP was being trailed by volunteers with a wider trial planned for September 2017, with a view to having it openly available by the end of the year. Feasibility studies for Autonomous Vehicles (AVs) on the Guided Busway and Affordable Very Rapid Transit had been completed and funding secured for a third which would explore AVs on the Greater Cambridge research campuses. The Chairperson, as potential Portfolio Holder for this work stream paid tribute to the work being done and highlighted the importance of embracing new technology.

The Chief Executive reported on plans to improve the M11 and highlighted the importance of engaging with other agencies that had an influence on the area. GCP was in an active conversation with Highways England about their strategic route network and investment

plans. It was hoped to persuade them to include in their recommendations to the Department of Transport, plans to upgrade the M11 to a smart motorway, which effectively meant using the hard shoulder as an additional lane in peak times. A proposal would be brought to the Board in September seeking endorsement of plans to put forward a proposal to this effect. Discussions were also taking place on short term improvements to Girton interchange and as part of the longer term expressway and details would also be reported to a future meeting.

With reference to the Mouchel report, it was noted that 38 of the 40 actions had commenced. One of the remaining two, recruitment of a permanent Transport Director was not scheduled to start until later in 2017 and the final one, a refresh of the Transport Strategy could not start until other actions had been completed.

The Chairperson referred to the programme budget [page 109 of the agenda pack] and queried plans to spend £163m when the total budget was £108m. The Finance Officer referred to the 2017/18 budget setting report and explained that the total expenditure budgets across infrastructure and operations were £175m. Total income funding was £100m from the City Deal grant, but it was also assumed that there would be a new homes bonus of £25m and Section 106 receipts of £45m. The total budgeted spend was £175m against income funding of £170m and it had been agreed that the £5m deficit would be a managed risk and kept under review as the cost of schemes was confirmed and additional funding secured. The Chairperson pointed out that it was not possible to merge the New Homes Bonus, the Board has specifically said it could be looked at together but not merged. In relation to Section 106 monies, he asked how much Section 106 money had been identified. In response it was confirmed that at this stage it was only an estimate for the future, but it was considered a realistic estimate. Councillor Bates undertook to look into this in more detail and provide an update as this fell within his County Council role.

With reference to the forward plan, the Chairperson noted earlier reference to an update on the M11 and the Girton Interchange being added to the agenda for the September meeting. In response the Chief Executive explained this may be incorporated into the progress report. In response to a question, it was confirmed that the Western Orbital report would also include options for park and cycle at junction 12. The November meeting would include items on rural transport hubs and a report back on the mass transit study.

Councillor Herbert pointed out that it was planned to work differently from September through the Working Groups and would welcome an indication of those items that could be brought forward for consideration. He also thought it would be helpful to timetable for November an update on joint working with the Mayor and the Combined Authority. In response, the Chief Executive confirmed she would be happy to bring a report on joint working. With reference to new ways of working, assuming the proposals were approved, the plan was to introduce a longer gap between Joint Assembly and Board meetings from November. The work that the task and finish groups had been doing would feed into the new working groups and the plan was to feed back on where those groups had got to on their thinking in November, which would influence decision making as part of the investment strategy.

The Executive Board **AGREED** unanimously to:

- a) Approve a net increase in the operational budget of £104k to be funded from drawing additional funding from the New Homes Bonus resource [Para. 3-5 of the report];

- b) Approve an increase of the budget for the independent economic assessment panel work by £30k from drawing additional funding from the New Homes Bonus resource [Appendix 4 to the report];
- c) Delegate authority to the Interim Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chairperson of the Executive Board and the Economy and Environment Portfolio Holder, to sign off the Locality Evaluation Framework and Outline Evaluation Plan [Appendix 4 to the report];
- d) Approve a revision to the start date for the Links to East Cambridgeshire and NCN11 Fen Ditton Scheme from September 2017 to January 2018.

12. A428/A1303 BETTER BUS JOURNEYS SCHEME

The Executive Board considered a report on progress with the A428/A1303 Better Bus Journeys Scheme. The report included an assessment of potential park and ride sites along the Cambourne to Cambridge corridor. Based on the outcome of this review, the Executive Board was being asked to identify a short list of sites for further development work.

The Chairperson reported that the Joint Assembly had supported the proposal but had suggested an amendment to recommendation (b), which was agreed with 13 votes in favour and 1 abstention and is shown in italics below:

Agree a short list of Park and Ride (P&R) sites for further development work, *excluding the site at Crome Lea Farm*, to enable a decision to be made at the September Board for a preferred site or sites to be consulted on.

The Chairperson reported that Councillor Lina Joseph had asked to speak on this item as local Member and invited her comment on the proposals. Councillor Joseph expressed concerns about the future proofing of the A428 Busway Scheme and made the following statement:

Given the preferred 3a route is quite likely to run right along the entire length of both Hardwick and Coton villages, and given such future-proofing seems quite likely to involve buses travelling at 100+ mph, I can only imagine that the infrastructure required to keep our communities safe will be visually very significant indeed. I therefore ask you to release details of what the worst-case scenario could be.

This is a major change from the scheme that has been consulted upon, so any decision that rules out alternatives should not be taken in September. In any case, no decision should be made until the true facts are known.

The Chairperson then invited Helen Bradbury, Chairperson of the A428 LLF, to present feedback on the Forum's views on these proposals. She highlighted six issues and associated questions, details of which are summarised below:

- The GCP is requested to defer decisions on the A428 Busway until such time as the both the high level mass transit study and the feasibility study on light rail has been completed and published, with adequate time given to allow the public to review and comment on these proposals. To proceed as before regardless of these developments would be on the basis of insufficient evidence and lack of knowledge of alternative options that could be brought

forward and would demonstrate a lack of co-ordination in terms of transport strategy. If we proceed otherwise we may end up with something incompatible, irreversible and having cost the taxpayer dear.

- The LLF does not consider option 3a to be a suitable alignment for rapid mass transit given its proximity to rural communities, the amount of infrastructure that would be required to keep those communities safe and its impact on sensitive green belt areas. The LLF asked that consideration was given instead to developing a more suitable alignment. She added this future proofing was a significant departure from the original proposals and something the public had not been consulted on. The LLF asked the GCP to clarify the size and extent of infrastructure that would be required for option 3a to take an as yet unspecified Rapid Mass Transit (RMT) scheme in order that the LLF could understand the implications.
- Does the Executive Board agree with the LLF that the option 3a alignment is potentially unsuitable for an unknown future RMT system and will the Executive Board consider developing a more flexible alignment more likely to link successfully with the wider transport schemes currently under consideration.
- The LLF was of the opinion that the Cambourne to Cambridge busway project should constitute no more than a low intervention solution, along the lines of LLF option 6, and /or including smart transport measures. This would allow those living West of Cambridge to access the City quickly and reliably, yet would be far less expensive and offer greater flexibility if /when rapid mass transit decisions were made. The LLF welcomed GCPs first stage work on option 6 and asked the Executive Board to recommend taking forward option 6 for further assessment.
- The LLF endorsed the technical group's scoring of options 1, 3a and 6 as a fair and transparent appraisal and had serious concerns about the Consultant's scoring in Table 15 of the report. The LLF had collaborated in the process, but this outcome showed a basic disregard for its views; in particular the September 2016 assessments. The consultants had stated they would issue a rebuttal, but that was not what the LLF wanted. Instead it wished to continue to collaborate and arrive at a solution based on the criteria set in the first place. The LLF asked the Executive Board to ask the officers to collaborate again with it to try and produce a consensus position with regard to the scoring of the Multi Criteria Assessment Framework (MCAF) table.
- The LLF welcomed the GCPs decision to extend the search for suitable park and ride sites and had been given the opportunity to review the terms of reference for the study. It was concerned that the three highest scoring sites had not been included in the shortlist and that the two sites at Madingley Mulch had been included retrospectively, including Crome Lea again, but not even its amended 2016 form. As for the new proposal under the water tower [Madingley Road West], the LLF would like to draw the Executive Board's attention to the fact that this would be visible from three counties, one as far as 12 miles away. The LLF asked the Executive Board to uphold the Joint Assembly's recommendation to remove Crome Lea from the shortlist.

In conclusion, Ms Bradbury reminded the Executive Board that the LLF would like to see the GCP consider again investigating inbound flow control. A resolution to this effect had been passed at the meeting in LLF meeting in March, but to date no response received.

At this stage in the proceedings the Chairperson invited members of the public to ask questions relating to this item, which had been submitted in line with the provisions of Standing Orders. He explained that a response to the questions asked would be covered in the officer presentation on the report. Details of the questions and answers are set out in Appendix A to the minutes.

The Interim Transport Director in introducing the report clarified that the Executive Board had asked officers to look again at potential park and ride sites in October 2016. At that time, although Crome Lea was not mentioned in name, to all intents and purposes, that was the site that was being debated. In addition to that, officers were asked to look at Scotland Farm. When those sites were assessed it was acknowledged that the transport analysis gave insufficient focus to environmental factors. Given the concerns about environmental impact, it was agreed to look at the sites purely on environmental term, with a view to identifying sites that were least environmentally intrusive. Following the Executive Board's decision on a short list, further work would be done on these sites, bringing transport back into the equation. The outcome of this work, including a full analysis of each site, would be brought to the September meeting round.

Responding to questions from the LLF not already covered, the Interim Transport Director:

- Saw no reason to defer a decision on the A428 Busway. He explained that the proposed comparator study was about modes of transport most appropriate for Greater Cambridge, not alignment. The Executive Board was not being asked to commit to anything other than the scheme currently under consideration. The aim was to identify a future proofed transport corridor which could be suitable for a variety of transport modes.
- With reference to option 3a's suitability for RMT, this would be the subject of further consultation and work if RMT turned out to be the preferred option following the comparator study. The aim was to make sure that the alignment of it was such that it could possibly accommodate RMT, subject to all other consultations.
- The selection of sites had taken account of the Consultant's recommendation that these be spread along the route as opposed to simply focusing on the top three.
- With reference to the recommendation to remove Crome Lea from the shortlist, from a transparency/process point of view, the Interim Director's recommendation was that the Executive Board should allow Crome Lea to go forward on the basis that this had been one of the sites considered in October 2016. It would be difficult to justify removing it at this stage when only a partial assessment had been done, looking only at environmental factors.

Referring to a number of comments about scoring, the Interim Transport Director explained that at this stage in the process, this was not relevant as the recommendation was to bring the analysis of option 6 up to the same level of detail as the other sites. This would enable the Executive Board to make an informed decision at the next stage in the process.

The Executive Board was invited to consider and comment on the proposals, taking into account feedback from the Joint Assembly, questions from local Members and the public and officer responses. The response to questions of clarification and main points of discussion are summarised below:

- In response to a question from Professor Allmendinger, it was agreed that officers should look at rebranding the scheme, removing reference to 'bus'. This took account of the earlier decision to investigate strategic transport options and that the mode of transport may, or not be busses.
- Councillor Bates sought clarification of the procurement process. In response the Interim Transport Director explained that due to time constraints, the work would be done by the consultants currently being used. It would however be made very clear to them that the scope was wider than bus and they should also look at all on road and off road options.
- The Chairperson drew attention to the comparison set out in Table 15 [page 153 of the agenda pack] and sought clarification that this was a preliminary assessment and that officers would now work this up in more detail, to the same quality standard used for assessing options 1 and 3a. He commented that the intention was always that this would be an evidence based process and drew attention to comments from the LLF and Coton Parish Council pressing for a full analysis of option 6. The Interim Transport Director confirmed that this was the case and the recommendations before the Executive Board sought approval to do this.
- Referring to the table on page 147 of the agenda pack, showing the multi criteria analysis of the park and ride sites, the Chairperson asked if this represented a full environmental assessment. He also asked if these scores would be the ones that would go forward, or was there more to be done. In response, the Interim Transport Director stated that this was an initial analysis, which would now be looked at alongside other factors, transport being one.
- The Chairperson referred to the workshop that took place at Cambourne Village College, which was mentioned in the background papers. He thanked all concerned for giving up their time to participate in this event and asked how the feedback from this exercise would be fed into the process. In response, the Interim Transport Director explained that the purpose of the workshop was to identify what people felt were the key criteria for determining an appropriate location for a park and ride site. This information would be taken into account by the consultants in taking forward the options appraisal work.
- In introducing the debate, the Chairperson summarised three essential points emerging from the discussion, to pause the whole thing or keep going; if work was to progress should the study of option 6 be taken forward to full quality level; and whether work on the park and ride sites start.
- Councillor Herbert confirmed that issues with the study had in part been addressed by commissioning the appraisal of rapid mass transit options, agreed earlier in the meeting. He referred to the Mayor's enthusiasm for light rail, but stressed that until the study had been completed, it was not possible to come up with answers as to whether it was deliverable, fundable and how it compared with different options for different routes. To have a county-wide or core light rail system involved a very large sum of funding as well as a need for a lot of risk taking by whoever was going to deliver it.
- Councillor Herbert was concerned by the suggestion that work on this or any other scheme should stop given the significant issues to be addressed by the GCP. He explained that as a Board member he took very seriously the need to come up with solutions that would achieve transport links to the growing communities

surrounding Cambridge. It was also essential to take into account the likely growth in transport if the Oxford Milton Keynes expressway came about. Also, until the Girton interchange was developed, there was a major blockage caused by the inadequate planning of the A14.

- Councillor Bates drew attention to the range of options that would be considered by the planned options appraisal. He also noted a number of other factors relevant to the A428 transport corridor, including planned work by Highways England between Caxton Gibbet and the Black Cat Roundabout and significant housing development planned across the Bedfordshire border adjacent to St Neots. With that in mind, he was not in favour of delaying this proposal.
- Professor Allmendinger repeated his earlier comment about the importance of distinguishing between transport routes and modes. He agreed that it was not appropriate to delay. He had recently discussed this with the Mayor, who had agreed that we should distinguish between the two and not delay the transport routes in a discussion about the modes of transport that might go along those routes. The Chairperson expressed his support for this view.
- With reference to the proposed park and ride sites, the Executive Board acknowledged the comments made by the Interim Transport Director and was supportive of progressing with an appraisal of all shortlisted sites. Councillor Herbert explained that while he had concerns about the Crome Lea site, from a process point of view it was important to show that the Executive Board had linked any decision not to proceed with this site to clear evidence.
- In acknowledging comments and concerns raised the assessment of the option 6 alignment, should this proceed, it would be important to demonstrably show that the final assessment was neutral and independent.

In response to feedback from the LLF about deferral, Councilor Herbert moved the following amendment, which was duly seconded and on being put to the vote, approved unanimously:

That the following words be added to the end of recommendation (a):

'and agrees that while the mass transit options appraisal takes place, work must continue in parallel to develop existing proposals to connect people between homes and jobs in Greater Cambridge, while ensuring they are future proofed so that they can be adapted for new solutions as they emerge'.

The Executive Board **AGREED** unanimously to:

- a) Note the progress to date on the scheme development *and agrees that while the mass transit options appraisal takes place, work must continue in parallel to develop existing proposals to connect people between homes and jobs in Greater Cambridge, while ensuring they are future proofed so that they can be adapted for new solutions as they emerge;*
- b) Approve a short list of Park and Ride sites for further development work to enable a decision to be made at the September Board for a preferred site or sites to be consulted on;

- c) That further work be undertaken in respect of an Option 6 alignment; and
- d) Approve the next steps/ timetable detailed in the report.

Amendment to officer recommendation shown in italic text.

13. CROSS CITY CYCLING - DETERMINATION OF TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS

The Executive Board considered a report seeking approval for a number of Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) associated with the five Cross City Cycling Schemes approved by the Executive Board in June 2016. It was noted that TROs and formal notices had been advertised for the following scheme elements:

- Fulbourn Road (Robin Hood junction to ARM main entrance), no waiting at any time;
- Hills Road (Purbeck Road to Addenbrooke's roundabout), a loading ban operating 07.00-10.00 and 16.00-19.00, Monday to Friday, and an extension of no waiting at any time into the length between Long Road and Addenbrooke's main entrance;
- Green End Road (Scotland Road to Water Lane and Evergreens to Kendal Way), no waiting at any time with short length of waiting limited to 2 hours outside the shops;
- Green End Road, proposed 'speed cushions'; and
- B1047 Fen Ditton, proposed 'raised table' junction.

The Chairperson reported that the Joint Assembly had supported these proposals.

At this stage in the proceedings the Chairperson invited members of the public to ask questions relating to this item, which had been submitted in line with the provisions of Standing Orders. He explained that a response to the questions asked would be covered in the officer presentation on the report. Details of the questions and answers are set out in Appendix A to the minutes.

In introducing the proposals the Cycling Projects Team Leader drew the Executive Board's attention the objections received to the Hills Road and Green End Road proposals, details of which were set out in the report.

The Executive Board was invited to consider and comment on the proposals, taking into account feedback from the Joint Assembly, public questions and officer responses. The response to questions of clarification and main points of discussion are summarised below:

- Councillor Herbert confirmed he had discussed the Green End Road proposals with local members and was of the opinion it should proceed but be kept under review. If problems emerged that it could be revisited. He pointed out that not allowing parking would have a significant impact on businesses and their ability to trade. Alternative options, such as that suggested by Mr Jenks could be considered should problems emerge.
- Councillor Bates suggested that a review take place 9 months after the new arrangement were introduced. By that time the impact of Cambridge North Station would be clearer and residents could be invited to comment on the impact of the new arrangements. This approach was supported by the Executive Board.

The Executive Board **AGREED** to:

- a) Note the objections and comments received;
- b) Approve the orders and notices as advertised; *
- c) Inform the objectors accordingly; and
- d) Receive in future only those Orders that have received objections.

* Councillor Herbert had declared an interest in the Hills Road TRO as a Hills Road resident and abstained from voting on this proposal. He voted in favour of the other TROs which were approved unanimously.

14. CITY ACCESS STRATEGY

The Executive Board considered a report which detailed progress and direction of travel with the City Access Strategy which aimed to reduce traffic flows through the City with the provision of more sustainable alternatives.

In introducing the recommendations the Interim Transport Director referred to the results of the Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) survey which were imminent. It was unfortunate that they had not been available in time for inclusion in this report. He confirmed that they would be included in the September Executive Board report. He clarified that the cameras recognised number plates and could contact the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency (DVL) who would identify vehicle type. He emphasised that DVL would not identify who the vehicle belonged to, which he acknowledged had been a matter of some concern for residents. The survey identified where vehicles had come from and where they went, which would help inform work on City access and demand management.

The Interim Transport Director also outlined plans to send a Travel Diary questionnaire to all properties within the Greater Cambridge area. This would seek views on current travel, what people would like to do and what was stopping them from doing this. Responses would enrich current information by including details of what people would like the opportunity to do. From late September/October a number of consultation exercises in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire to allow people to come forward and explain their issues and frustrations.

The Chairperson reported that the Joint Assembly had supported these proposals.

The Executive Board was invited to consider and comment on the proposals and the response to questions of clarification and main points of discussion are summarised below:

- The Chairperson drew attention to the significant amount of good work that was being done in response to the Strategy.
- In response to a question from the Chairperson, it was confirmed that the data from the ANPR study would be widely available in graphical, easily understood formats. It was hoped to make the raw data available for others to use.

- Councillor Bates asked if the ANPR data would include school journeys. In response the Interim Traffic Director confirmed that the exercise was done at the beginning of June so this would be the case. The ANPR survey would not be able to identify specifically school journeys, although routes may indicate potential journeys to schools. The travel diary data would help with this.
- With reference to paragraph 11 on page 185 of the agenda pack, Professor Allmendinger asked what baseline was used when measuring reductions in traffic flows. In response, the Interim Transport Director explained that the baseline was based on measurements taken in 2011. The aim was to reduce traffic flows, including any increases over the interim period up to 2031 by 10-15%.
- In response to a question on Workplace Parking Levy (WPL), the Interim Transport Director reported a lot of work had been done to look at Nottingham, which was the only place that had adopted WPL. They were very clear that for Nottingham WPL was not about reducing demand but raising revenue to support its travel network. Detailed work on this had been deferred pending receipt of detailed information from the ANPR, Travel Diary data and feedback from the Autumn consultation exercise. The Chairperson confirmed that he was on record as supporting WPL as a means of securing revenue to support transport initiatives.
- The Chairperson drew attention to the Electric Hybrid Bus Feasibility Study [page 193 of the agenda pack] and asked how this would progress. In response, the Interim Transport Director confirmed that a detailed report and recommendations would be brought to a future Executive Board meeting, hopefully in September. This would need to consider hybrid and electric options. There were some issues with electric busses, particularly range and limited suppliers of double decker electric busses. However the Government had announced recently an additional £290m to support the development of battery technology. It had also announced that by 2040 there would be no combustible engines. He added that there was a problem with the ability to tap into the existing electrical network in Cambridge which may require reinforcing, but a number of other options were being investigated, such as creating solar farms at some of the park and ride sites.
- Councillor Herbert hoped that further work could be done to progress the Clean Air Zone approved in January and to tackle poor air quality in the City. Following the Government's announcement, there was potential to seek to get Cambridge as one of the lead cities and Councillor Herbert had written the then Secretary of State about this. He had not yet received a reply but would follow this up. Councillor Bates supported this and drew attention to the very clear evidence about air quality and links to premature deaths. The Chairperson agreed and drew attention to the fact that the new Smart City App would tell everyone how bad the air quality was.
- In response to a question about on street parking controls, the Interim Transport Director explained that the County Council was concerned about displacement. An analysis of the potential impact of the proposed resident parking schemes was undertaken and Appendix C [page 203 of the agenda pack] explained the results of this work. It had been concluded that further analysis was required and the outcome would be reported to the Executive Board and the County Council's Highways and Infrastructure Committee in September.

- The Chairperson drew attention to the Traffic Signals Review, in particular information on the number of traffic signals in Cambridge, with 52 of the 82 junctions in the City having been installed in their current format for over ten years. The Interim Transport Director confirmed that a full review of the network would be undertaken to determine where upgrading was needed and make operation of the network as efficient as possible. In response to a question from Councillor Bates, it was confirmed the study would incorporate signals on the outskirts of Cambridge. The timing of this work had yet to be confirmed but it was hoped the outcome would be reported to the Executive Board early in the New Year.
- With reference to Rural Transport Hubs, the Executive Board noted plans to address increase travel demand to the already busy CBC site following the transfer of 1,800 staff from Papworth. The University of Cambridge and CBC had commissioned a West of Cambridge to CBC bus service feasibility study, attached as Appendix D [page 205 of the agenda pack]. The possibility of retaining 200 parking spaces on the Papworth site was being investigated. This would operate as a Rural Hub Park and Ride Site, serviced by a timetabled shuttle bus serving the CBC site. This would be a registered service, able to pick other people up. Initial estimates were that such a service would require revenue support in the region of £100,000 per annum over a three year period. The Chairperson explained that this was exactly the type of thing a WPL could fund.
- In response to a question, the Interim Transport Director explained that City Access was currently looking at ways of accelerating the delivery of the Nine Wells cycle path, which came off the A1307 and into the CBC site. Section 106 funding was triggered by a certain number of properties being developed on the site. Officers were looking at the possibility of providing up front funding for this pending the availability of Section 106 monies, but discussions were at an early stage.

The Executive Board **AGREED** unanimously to:

- a) Note the updates;
- b) Note the feasibility studies and receive further reports in September on the findings and recommendations in respect of:
 - i. Use of Electric/ Hybrid buses; and
 - ii. A review of the Cambridge Traffic Signal network;
- c) Agree to carry out further consultation and engagement with residents and the business community in both Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire on their transport needs and issues, as part of a wider 'Travel Diary' exercise, to help understand existing travel patterns, issues and incentives to change; including working with businesses to understand needs of employees from travel to work areas outside of the Greater Cambridge area; and
 - i. To determine local transport priorities that could receive funding were a Workplace Parking Levy (WPL) to be introduced, building on employers' evidence of transport needs and in coordination with the Greater Cambridge Partnership;
 - ii. To coordinate with and, if feasible, form part of the GCP and the Local Enterprise Partnership's broader engagement with the business community;

- iii. To develop and provide practical support for employers and schools looking to manage their parking demand and provision working closely with Travel for Cambridge;

and report back the findings to a future meeting of the Board; and

- d) Agree that the Director of Transport continues to negotiate a potential funding contribution for a Rural Hub Park and Ride service to be located at the soon-to-be-closed Papworth Hospital serving the Cambridge Biomedical Campus; and that a report be brought back to the next meeting.

15. IMPROVING GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP GOVERNANCE

The Executive Board considered a report seeking approval of a package of proposals to strengthen governance arrangements of the GCP. The aim was to make better use of the expertise of Joint Assembly members earlier in the project and programme development lifecycle; to strengthen pre-decision scrutiny and clarify roles and responsibilities. The report also set out how the public questions process was being improved and stakeholder engagement strengthened.

The Chairperson reported that the Joint Assembly had supported these proposals and confirmed its support for the draft principles for setting its Work Programme. It had also nominated representatives to sit on the proposed Working Groups, in anticipation of the Executive Board approving the recommendations contained in the report.

At this stage in the proceedings the Chairperson invited Wendy Blythe to ask her questions relating to this item, which had been submitted in line with the provisions of Standing Orders. He explained that a response to the question would be covered in the officer presentation on the report. Details of the question and answer are set out in Appendix A to the minutes.

In introducing the proposals the Programme Director explained that the Executive Board and Joint Assembly had been reflecting on a number of aspects of the programme, including governance. A task and finish group had developed a package of proposals which aimed to preserve the identified strengths of the governance arrangements but also identified areas for improvement. It was proposed to adopt a portfolio holder approach, to provide clear Executive Board member leadership of the various aspects of the programme. Working Groups would be set up, chaired by the relevant Portfolio Holder. This would engage with Joint Assembly members much earlier in the policy and planning process, making full use of their expertise. Reporting arrangements would improve and there would be a longer gap between Joint Assembly and Executive Board meetings. It was proposed to review the new arrangements about a year after implementation to ensure they had met the objectives.

The Executive Board was invited to consider and comment on the proposals, taking into public questions and officer responses. The response to questions of clarification and main points of discussion are summarised below:

- Responding to Wendy Blythe's comments about the SYSTRA Study [page 205 of the agenda pack] the Interim Transport Director confirmed that consultants were given a full remit to look at everything. He clarified that this was not a GCP study, but had been undertaken on behalf of all partners by the University. He explained that SYSTRA had picked up on a separate review of potential bus layover sites and that is what led to the suggestion of Silver Street as a possible bus terminus site. This was a statement of fact and not a conclusion, proposal or

recommendation.

- Councillor Herbert recognised the strength of feeling and offered to talk to FeCRA on a number of these issues. He dismissed any suggestion that the City was being trashed as nonsense. There was a lot to be proud of and he drew attention to the listening and engagement that had formed part of the Milton Road scheme. The GCP had learned a lot from the LLFs and this type of engagement. The focus was on delivering major improvements for this City, linking homes and jobs.
- Professor Allmendinger stated that Ms Blythe's general portrayal of the GCP was not one he recognised. He had been a Board member since February and he did not see it working in the way she describes its approach and methods of working. With reference to comments made about the SYSTRA report, he confirmed that the University had simply managed this because it had people working for it in transport. He knew Silver Street well and any proposal for a bus terminus there was not part of the University's plans, it was not the University's land. He was not entirely sure why that line was put in the report, did not recognise why that proposal was there or where it was going.
- The Chairperson expressed concern about reference to Silver Street and referred to people commenting about 'fake news from FeCRA. He stressed that no attempt had been made to raise concerns with him or with the former Chairperson or to check facts before making a statement. The same applied to FeCRA's recent statement about cobbles. The Chief Executive reported that she had met with Ms Blythe and was keen to try and develop an effective working relationship with FeCRA. However, she drew attention to an article in the Cambridge Independent by a resident of Milton Road reflecting that they never did have faith in consultation, but that view had changed as a result of the approach taken to that scheme. For balance, she wanted to register that GCP was going out of its way to try to engage more constructively with residents and reflect their views.
- With reference to the revised governance arrangements, Councillor Herbert recalled a conversation about the amount of work involved in the Transport area and a suggestion that a second Executive Board member would be identified to contribute to that. Councillor Bates, as potential Transport Portfolio Holder confirmed that he would welcome Councillor Herbert's involvement in this work.

The Chairperson reported that this was the last meeting Tanya Sheridan, would attend, after two hard working years as Programme Director. He recalled that Tanya had been instrumental in the formation of the City Deal and getting it up and running. On behalf of the Executive Board and officers he expressed enormous appreciation for the hard work Tanya had put in during easy and difficult times.

The Executive Board **AGREED** unanimously to:

- a) Approve the Portfolios, the generic portfolio role description and their allocation between Board members (Appendix 1);
- b) The creation of the five, portfolio-themed informal Board and Joint Assembly Working Groups to bring the energy and expertise of Joint Assembly members to strategy and project development earlier and agrees their membership and terms of reference (Appendix 2), subject to Councillor Lewis Herbert joining the Transport Working Group to support Councillor Ian Bates as the Transport Portfolio Holder;

- c) Agrees Board meetings should be 2-monthly during 2018, with a review of frequency midway through the year;
- d) There should be a longer interval between the Assembly and Board of around 3 weeks as soon as practicable and notes the proposed reporting improvements of that advice at appendix 3;
- e) Agrees the principles for officer delegations and scheme of delegation for the Greater Cambridge Partnership in Appendix 4;
- f) Note and endorse the principles for the setting of the Joint Assembly work programme in Appendix 5;
- g) A review of governance arrangements commencing a year after implementation, to consider how effective the changes have been; and
- h) Note other actions taken to improve public questions and ensure all Executive Board member declarations of interest are up to date.

16. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Executive Board **NOTED** that the next meeting would take place at 4.00 p.m. on Wednesday 20th September at South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne.

**The Meeting ended
at 4.15 p.m.**
