



**GREATER
CAMBRIDGE
CITY DEAL**

Securing future prosperity

GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL EXECUTIVE BOARD

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board held on
Thursday, 8 December 2016 at 4.00 p.m.

Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board:

Cllr Lewis Herbert	Cambridge City Council (Chairman)
Cllr Francis Burkitt	South Cambridgeshire District Council (Vice-Chairman)
Cllr Ian Bates	Cambridgeshire County Council
Nigel Slater	University of Cambridge

Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly in Attendance:

Cllr Roger Hickford	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Bridget Smith	South Cambridgeshire District Council

Officers/advisors:

Patrick Adams	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Ashley Heller	Cambridgeshire County Council
Bob Menzies	Cambridgeshire County Council
Mike Salter	Local Highways Authority
Tanya Sheridan	City Deal Partnership

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Mark Reeve, Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting held on 13 November 2016 were agreed as a correct record.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Professor Nigel Slater declared a pecuniary interest in agenda item 8: "Western Orbital – Public Consultation and Next Steps", as his employer potentially stood to benefit from the proposed infrastructure improvements along the Western Orbital corridor. Professor Slater left the Chamber when this item was discussed and did not participate in the debate.

Councillor Lewis Herbert declared a non-pecuniary interest in question 5 of agenda item 4: "Public Questions", as a resident of Hills Road.

4. QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Questions by members of the public were asked and answered as follows:

Question from Stephen Coates

Stephen Coates read out his pre-submitted questions:

- Why did the City Deal Board state that Cambridge University has never supported a busway across the West Fields when its agents Carter Jonas are stating that

development of the land North of Barton Road could provide land and funding for such a busway?

- When the Board issued its response to Save the West Fields' question on governance on 9 November 2016, why did you amend the statement of Cambridge University to exclude these key words which were said on October 13th (even though it was described as University statement by Nigel Slater read out by the Chair at the Board meeting on 13 October 2016)?
- In view of the fact Cambridge University and Colleges have now offered to part pay for the A428 busway by developing West Fields with housing, how can you argue they have not influenced a route over the West Fields since their consultation submission in November 2015?
- Is it correct that Corpus Christi College, a member of the NBRLOG has offered Dumping Farm as a site for a park and ride cycle facility, again offering an incentive for a location of the Orbital route East of the M11?
- Can you say whether the City Deal as a body has ever threatened either an individual, a business or an organisation with legal action or taken legal action against any person, business or organisation? If so, who is responsible for authorising such action and what has the cost to date been for legal advice and intervention resulting from such action and what has the cost to date been, for legal advice and intervention resulting from such actions? If legal threats or action have been entered into by the City Deal as a body, are they prepared to make the details public?

Professor Nigel Slater explained that, as set out in its original response to the City Deal consultation on A428 Cambourne to Cambridge bus route submitted in November 2015, the University supported enabling further public transport accessibility to the West Cambridge Site, which is a major employment site, and which has submitted a planning application for further academic and commercial research developments.

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, explained that no such legal action had been taken, as the "City Deal" was a joint committee and not an organisation in its own right. Were there any consideration of legal action it would be that taken by one or more of the partner councils.

Stephen Coates stated that he did not consider that his questions had been answered. Councillor Lewis Herbert explained that he had been offered Stephen Coates a meeting and this offer still stood.

Question from Robin Pellew of Cambridgeshire Past, Present and Future

Robin Pellew read out his pre-submitted questions:

- What arrangements are the City Deal and the County Council putting in place with the operators to create Enhanced Partnerships?
- Does the County Council have plans to control bus services post-devolution under a franchise model?
- Will the City Deal instruct the County Council to carry out an envisioning exercise, including operators and passengers, to determine with a better bus service might comprise?

Bob Menzies, Director of Strategy and Development at Cambridgeshire County Council, explained that the situation was uncertain as the Buses Bill was still progressing through Parliament and was likely to be subject to further changes. Any decision regarding the implementation of a franchise model would be made by the Combined Authority, for both Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, and not the County Council. Councillor Francis Burkitt expressed his support for working more closely with private bus operators. It was noted

that any planned improvement of the bus service would have to be part of wider strategy.

Question from Penny Heath (on behalf of Edward Leigh)

Penny Heath read out the following questions that had been pre-submitted by Edward Leigh:

- Does the Board recognise the need to invest more in communications to mitigate the risks of failing to engage with stakeholders and the wider population?
- The Communications team are currently updating the marketing and communications strategy. Is the Board satisfied that it is adequately resourced?
- Is the Board satisfied that the Communications team has access to the right expertise, outside the councils where necessary?

In particular, does the Board recognise that:

- Poorly-designed consultation questionnaires limit the value of the data collected, and can miss important opportunities?
- Designing questionnaires that are engaging, balanced and meaningful is a specialist skill, which (on past evidence) needs to be bought in from outside the councils?

P.S. When may I expect to receive answers to my questions submitted to the Executive Board on 1 September and 10 November?

Councillor Lewis Herbert stated that considerable progress had been made with regard to strengthening the City Deal communications team. A dedicated Communications Manager had been appointed and a digital media officer had been recruited jointly with the City Council. Greater use was being made of social media, including the live tweeting of meetings. A communications survey was currently accessible via the website. Local communities affected by the proposed scheme were also being engaged via the Local Liaison Forums and workshops.

It was noted that officers had met with Edward Leigh and answered the questions he submitted on 1 September and 10 November, and this would be supplemented in writing.

Question from Wendy Blythe

Wendy Blythe read out a statement expressing concerns about the design and implementation of Phase 1 of the Hills Road Cycleway improvement scheme delivered recently through Cycle City Ambition Grant (CCAG) and the City Deal cross-city cycling Hills Road to Addenbrooke's scheme. Concerns included:

- CCAG scheme was over budget and took longer than anticipated.
- The safety for cyclists on the CCAG scheme.
- Lack of drainage on CCAG scheme.
- The group reviewing the CCAG scheme will not meet until February, whilst the plans for the Hills Road to Addenbrooke's scheme will be displayed in January and are due to start in February.
- Need for experts in landscape design to be involved in the Hills Road to Addenbrooke's scheme.
- Need for an independent review of the CCAG scheme.

Bob Menzies, Director of Strategy and Development at Cambridgeshire County Council, explained that the Arbury Road scheme, which was very similar to the Hills Road scheme, had been under budget and only a week later than scheduled. Extensive evaluation and monitoring was taking place as part of the Department for Transport Cycle City Ambition programme.

It was noted that the member led review was due to report back to the County Council's Economy and Environment Committee in March 2017. Councillor Lewis Herbert stated

that he would meet with officers to discuss the timetable and to ensure that lessons learnt from the CCAG schemes would inform the Hills Road to Addenbrooke's scheme.

5. PETITIONS

No petitions had been received for this meeting.

6. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE JOINT ASSEMBLY

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly, stated that he would report the recommendations of the Assembly under the relevant agenda items.

7. CITY DEAL PROGRESS REPORT

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, presented the City Deal progress report, which updated the Executive Board on the progress that had been made on the various workstreams and provided a timetable for future work.

A428-M11 segregated bus route / A428 corridor Park & Ride / Madingley Road bus priority

Ashley Heller, Team Leader - Public Transport Projects, explained that workshops discussing the above project had been set up between January and July 2017.

Housing

Tanya Sheridan explained that if a wholly owned Local Authority company were to be established it would require that agreement of the full councils of all three local authorities.

Payment-by-results mechanism

Tanya Sheridan agreed to bring an extended report on this to the Executive Board's meeting in June.

The Executive Board **NOTED** the report.

8. WESTERN ORBITAL

Ashley Heller, Team Leader – Public Transport Projects, presented this report on the outcome of the consultation on future options for bus and cycle infrastructure improvements along the Western Orbital corridor.

Helen Bradbury gave a presentation on behalf of the Local Liaison Forum (LLF), which made the following points:

- The plan to extend the current Park and Ride site at Trumpington was supported.
- A new Park and Ride site at Hauxton was not supported.
- The Park and Ride sites should be situated further from the City centre.
- There should be a full assessment of the A428 Cambourne to Cambridge options to make best use of the existing infrastructure.

Councillor Lewis Herbert stated that recommendations regarding the Cambourne to Cambridge route did not form part of the report on the agenda and no notice of decisions had been published, so the Executive Board could not make any decision on those recommendations under this item. Helen Bradbury explained that these recommendations went to the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly in September and so should have been available to the Executive Board. Councillor Lewis Herbert advised that a

meeting would be arranged with LLF and resident representatives, where these issues would be discussed.

Councillor Bridget Smith suggested that the Park and Ride sites should be moved further away from Cambridge so that traffic did not have to use a congested road to access the site. It was for this reason that the LLF supported the Scotland Farm site on the Cambourne to Cambridge route. It was suggested that residents could cycle to the Park and Ride sites. A five mile radius from the City Centre was suggested. Councillor Roger Hickford explained that the Park and Ride sites only had the capacity to be part of the solution.

Councillor Bridget Smith explained that she had revised her opinion on the need for bus hub at Foxton, as the village was already served by a train station.

Councillor Francis Burkitt stated that as the City Deal Portfolio Holder for South Cambridgeshire District Council he had contacted all the district's parish councils, asking if they could suggest a suitable site for a bus hub. He would share the results of this consultation shortly. He expressed the hope that funding could be found for rural transport hubs.

Bob Menzies explained that the Western Orbital scheme was currently not in tranche 1, but that it was closely linked by tranche 1 schemes.

Bob Menzies, Director of Strategy and Development at Cambridgeshire County Council, stated that Highways England were opposed to the inclusion of a bus only slip road on the hard shoulder of the M11. He also explained that whilst making a section of the M11 a "managed motorway" would improve traffic flow it could increase congestion closer to Cambridge, as many M11 journeys were local. Councillor Ian Bates recommended that the Executive Board contact Essex County Council to discuss the possible impact the M11 improvements would have on the southern parts of the motorway.

It was hoped that Highways England would give the go ahead for the M11 to become a "managed motorway" in the period in 2020-2025.

Councillor Francis Burkitt expressed the hope that the access to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus could be improved.

Councillor Lewis Herbert stated that all projects needed to be justified in terms of value for money. He added that on-road options would be pursued where they were practical and there was adequate capacity, with off-road solutions pursued if the case for on-road options was insufficient.

Councillor Roger Hickford explained that the recommendations in the report had been supported by the Joint Assembly with 12 votes in favour and one abstention. There was particular support for improving the Girton interchange.

Councillor Ian Bates proposed amending the recommendations in the report to include arranging a meeting between Highway England and the Executive Board and the Joint Assembly members to make a case for:

- Making a section of the M11 a "managed motorway".
- Improving junctions 11 and 13 of the M11.
- Remodelling the Girton interchange.

Councillor Lewis Herbert seconded this and requested that the local MPs should also be invited to this meeting.

The Executive Board **AGREED** to:

- I. Note the responses to the consultation on the Western Orbital bus infrastructure improvement scheme.
- II. the next steps as set out in this report for the ongoing strategic assessment of the Western Orbital scheme as part of the City Deal programme to support related potential Tranche 1 schemes.
- III. to take a key role in working with Highways England to establish clear priorities along the M11 corridor and for these discussions to form part of the next report on the Western Orbital, and arrange a meeting of City Deal Board and Assembly members and officers and local MPs with Highways England, the minutes of which will appear on the City Deal's website, to press the case for firm commitments from them to improve the M11 west of Cambridge including:
 - (a) Making that section of the M11 a "managed motorway" and seek a date for that, and
 - (b) Improving the motorway junctions, including priorities for junctions 11 and 13.
 - (c) Remodelling the Girton interchange.

9. **M11 JUNCTION 11: BUS ONLY SLIP ROADS**

Bob Menzies, Director of Strategy and Development at Cambridgeshire County Council, introduced this report, which summarised the assessment of a southbound bus only off slip road at Junction 11 of the M11. He explained that uncertainties remained as to the long term plans of Highways England for the M11 as well as potential land use planning issues associated with Junction 11. He recommended that further works on this project should be integrated into the Western Orbital project to ensure that any strategic transport benefits could be achieved and full account taken of other issues on the corridor.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, stated that the Assembly had endorsed the report's recommendation. The Assembly had expressed concerns regarding the demand on Junction 11 from staff at AstraZeneca, which would increase when Papworth Hospital relocated.

Councillor Francis Burkitt suggested that work on Junction 11 should be carried out in 2017 and not have to wait for Tranche 2.

Councillor Lewis Herbert advised that the Police had the enforcement powers needed to prevent the use of private roads by through traffic wanting to access the Biomedical Campus site.

It was agreed that the Executive Board should liaise with representatives from the Biomedical Campus and also the Trumpington Residents' Association regarding the local pressures due to increased traffic going to the Biomedical Campus and to Addenbrooke's.

The Executive Board

AGREED that the M11 Junction 11 south bound bus only off slip road concept should be integrated into the Western Orbital project ensuring that any strategic transport and economic benefits may be realised and that a sustainable

phased proposal can be developed.

10. TRANCHE 2 PRIORITISATION

Mike Salter, Transport Strategy Manager, presented this report which updated the Executive Board on work prioritising transport infrastructure schemes for delivery in the second tranche of Greater Cambridge City Deal transport infrastructure programme from 2020 to 2025 and agree the next steps.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reminded the Executive Board that the Local Plans of Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire District Councils had not yet been agreed. He stated that there had been some concern expressed by the Assembly on how the funding would be managed, but the recommendations in the report had been endorsed, as it only called for officers to “explore potential use” of future City Deal funding.

Councillor Ian Bates stated that he supported the direction of travel, but recognised that there were several obstacles to overcome.

It was confirmed that the workshops scheduled for February/March 2017 would be jointly held with the Executive Board, the Joint Assembly, the business community and other stakeholders.

Councillor Francis Burkitt suggested that the Executive Board should ensure that some of the £200 million in Tranche 2 was kept in reserve, for new projects to be funded during the Tranche 2 period of 2020-25.

Concern was expressed about the potential to focus too closely on the traditional Benefit:Cost Ratio (BCR) at the expense of achieving the City Deal’s strategic objectives, and that prioritisation should be more wide-ranging than only traditional BCR measurement. Mike Salter assured the Executive Board that a multitude of criteria were used to assess which schemes should be prioritised and the BCR methodology was only one tool that was used.

The Executive Board

AGREED

- (a) that the headline objectives for the Tranche 2 prioritisation exercise are:
 - to prioritise transport infrastructure investments to prepare those which best meet the City Deal’s strategic objectives for delivery when funding becomes available (City Deal strategic objectives, which include economic growth and maintaining quality of life, are set out at Annex 1);
 - to ensure that those investments support the growth strategy set out in the Local Plans and the supporting Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire; and
 - To ensure the prioritisation is aligned to wider work by the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) on the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) and of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority.
- (b) To recognise dependencies between ongoing Tranche 1 work, the Local Plan examinations, the work of the Combined Authority, the Economic Assessment Panel, the Tranche 2 prioritisation exercise and Tranche 3 and agrees that potential alignment and synergies with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority be explored;
- (c) that the previously used criteria and methodology should be reviewed and built

on and that Board, Joint Assembly and other stakeholder input be sought on assessment criteria and methodology and the 'long list' through workshops in early 2017;

- (d) to note existing commitments to consider particular schemes through the Tranche 2 prioritisation process and confirms these;
- (e) Agrees to receive a further report in June recommending the prioritisation methodology and criteria and long list process, as well as the potential for synergies with the Combined Authority and other bodies;
- (f) officers should explore potential use of a proportion of future City Deal funding to:
 - create a potential 'rolling fund' for investment in transport infrastructure/ measures to unlock early growth from which a future repayment revenue stream would follow (for example from s106 contributions) and /or
 - create a fund for smaller scale measures (likely to be those costing less than £500 000) that could be bid into to allow delivery of measures that unblock localised barriers to growth and provide strong economic benefits in line with City Deal objectives.

These options would be brought back to the Board with the proposed long list in September 2017.

- (g) To endorse the outline timetable for recommending transport investment priorities for Tranche 2 and notes the key dependencies.

11. DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSPORT CONSULTATION ON WEBTAG

Mike Salter, Transport Strategy Manager, presented this report which asked the Executive Board to agree principles to be incorporated into a combined City Deal response to the Department of Transport's consultation on proposed changes to the estimation of wider economic impacts in transport appraisal guidance.

The Executive Board **AGREED**

- I. To submit a combined City Deal response to this consultation, in addition to responses that the partner organisations may wish to make individually.
- II. That the City Deal response should be framed around the principles set out in paragraph 13.
- III. To delegate to the City Deal Director, in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Executive Board and Cambridgeshire County Council's Executive Director: Economy, Transport and Environment, responsibility for submitting a full response to this consultation in accordance with these agreed principles.

12. CITY DEAL FINANCIAL MONITORING

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, introduced this report that provided the Executive Board with the financial monitoring position for the period ending 31 October 2016.

Bob Menzies, Director of Strategy and Development at Cambridgeshire County Council, stated that a report on the A10(N) study would be taken to June's meeting.

The Executive Board **NOTED** the report.

13. CITY DEAL FORWARD PLAN

Councillor Lewis Herbert introduced the discussion on the Forward Plan of decisions that will be taken at future meetings of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board.

It was agreed that the Communications Strategy, which was scheduled for January's meeting, should instead be incorporated into the March budget item where it has resource implications.

It was agreed that the Cambridge to Cambourne busway should be put on the Forward plan to be discussed in either March, June or July depending on other developments.

It was agreed that the Executive Board should discuss a report on the impact of devolution and the setting up of the Combined Authority. It was suggested that this should be scheduled for March's meeting, it was noted that the Combined Authority would have its first meeting in February.

Goodbye to Professor Nigel Slater

Councillor Lewis Herbert announced that this would be Professor Nigel Slater's final meeting. He thanked Professor Slater for all work on the Executive Board on behalf of Cambridge University and looked forward to working with his successor.

The Meeting ended at 6.30 p.m.
