



## GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL JOINT ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly held on  
Thursday, 7 July 2016 at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT:

### Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly:

Councillor Roger Hickford	Cambridgeshire County Council (Chairman)
Councillor Kevin Price	Cambridge City Council (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Dave Baigent	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Tim Bick	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Noel Kavanagh	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Maurice Leeke	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Bridget Smith	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Tim Wotherspoon	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Sir Michael Marshall	Marshall Group
Claire Ruskin	Cambridge Network
Andy Williams	AstraZeneca
Anne Constantine	Cambridge Regional College
Helen Valentine	Anglia Ruskin University
Dr John Wells	Cancer Research UK Cambridge Institute

### Members or substitutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board in attendance:

Councillor Ian Bates	Cambridgeshire County Council
----------------------	-------------------------------

### Officers/advisors:

Stephen Kelly	Cambridge City Council & South Cambridgeshire District Council
Andrew Limb	Cambridge City Council
Graham Hughes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Chris Malyon	Cambridgeshire County Council
Aaron Blowers	City Deal Partnership
Joanna Harrall	City Deal Partnership
Tanya Sheridan	City Deal Partnership
Noelle Godfrey	Connecting Cambridgeshire Partnership
Stella Cockerill	Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership
Alex Colyer	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Caroline Hunt	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Graham Watts	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Dr Ian Lewis	University of Cambridge

### 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Kevin Cuffley.

It was noted that this would be Anne Constantine's last meeting of the Joint Assembly, further to which Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman, took this opportunity to thank her on behalf of the Assembly for her commitment and valuable contributions.

## **2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 2 June 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

## **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Bridget Smith declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 8 as a trustee of the charity Forward Gamlingay, which had commissioned Form the Future to undertake a two year project.

Sir Michael Marshall wished to declare a pecuniary interest in any aspect of the Workplace Parking Levy that may be discussed at the meeting.

## **4. QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

Sir Michael Marshall had submitted a request for an update on the City Deal and its funding in light of the result of the EU Referendum and devolution proposals.

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, firstly addressed the issue of devolution, stating that this was additional to the City Deal and that it comprised of new money with funding in relation to the City Deal agreement between the Government and partners having not changed. The next step for the devolution deal was a public consultation on the proposed Mayoral Combined Authority. She reminded the Joint Assembly that the City Deal was a partnership programme with joint governance arrangements and that City Deal partners would need to decide how it would fit with a new Combined Authority. There were significant links and it would be important that the City Deal and devolution deal delivered sustainable economic growth for the benefit of local communities.

In respect of the EU Referendum, the outcome was having very significant consequences nationally and in the Greater Cambridge area. Tanya Sheridan said it was too early at this stage to say exactly what the implications were nationally or locally, or for the City Deal. Papers for this meeting had highlighted that the risk of a recession was much higher as a result of the outcome of the Referendum, which would mean a slower rate of housing delivery with implications for some City Deal funding streams. She added that there was also some evidence already of implications for skills, but committed to continue monitoring the situation closely.

In terms of the security of City Deal funding, Tanya Sheridan clarified that the agreement with Government committed funding for Tranche 1 of the City Deal, with Tranches 2 and 3 on the basis of independent economic assessments. She emphasised that the commitment from the Government in that respect had not changed but highlighted that the City Deal must be able to demonstrate that it was able to deliver and that benefits were realised in order to unlock future funding allocations. It was noted that, to date, £40 million had been received through two instalments and the balance of Tranche 1 funding was due to be paid in three instalments of £20 million in April 2017, April 2018 and April 2019. Assuming funding was made available for Tranches 2 and 3, following the independent economic assessments that would be undertaken in 2019 and 2024, those payments would be received in equal instalments each April. In the case of Tranche 2 this would be in 2025-2029, with Tranches 2 and 3 both expected to make available up to £200 million each with the precise amount dependant on the outcome of the independent economic

assessments.

The following questions by members of the public were asked and answered as follows:

**Question by Robin Pellew**

Robin Pellew was not in attendance at the meeting but asked, on behalf of Cambridge Past, Present and Future, whether the City Deal would share its traffic modelling of the effects of a 10-15% traffic reduction on the journey times of buses along the main arterial roads, particularly Histon Road, Milton Road and the A1303, both with and without the proposed new bus lanes.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, asked officers to provide Mr Pellew with a written response.

**Question by Wendy Blythe**

Wendy Blythe referred to a recent public meeting where over 200 people from Cambridge and local villages voted overwhelmingly to support the following motion:

“We have no confidence in the City Deal’s bus lane proposals, and consider the consultations and decision making processes to be flawed and lacking in transparency and the decision making processes to be non-evidential.

We call upon the City Deal to consider instead better, smarter ideas, such as those already suggested by experts and residents.”

She reported that a subsequent comment was that the City Deal leaders needed to go back to the Government and ask for more time to come up with better ideas that the whole community could support.

Wendy Blythe therefore asked what the Assembly’s response was in respect of the above resolution and the request that more time be allocated to improve City Deal proposals.

Councillor Hickford made the point that the Joint Assembly could not debate the issue at this meeting, since the required notice for such a debate had not been given with the agenda for the meeting. It was also noted that the agenda had already been published for the Executive Board meeting on 14 July 2016, so it too would not be able to debate the motion. Councillor Hickford agreed to consider this as an agenda item for the next meeting of the Joint Assembly.

Tanya Sheridan reminded the Joint Assembly that priority schemes for the City Deal had derived from the Joint Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire and the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans, all of which had been extensively consulted upon. The Executive Board had adopted the Tranche 1 programme at its meeting in January 2015 based on a range of factors undertaken as part of assessing the priority of schemes. This encompassed strong support for a range of measures which included demand management as well as improving public transport, cycling and walking. She added that a consistent theme in the call for evidence sessions in respect of city centre congestion was improving public transport. There were lots of aspects to improving public transport, but improving journey times and reliability would be key parts of that.

Councillor Hickford did not agree with the suggestion of going back to the Government and requesting more time. He said that the City Deal had to use the money allocated to it as wisely as possible, with any request for additional time potentially likely to negatively

impact future City Deal funding.

### **Question by Helen Bradbury**

Helen Bradbury welcomed the establishment of Local Liaison Forums by the Executive Board as part of its commitment to greater transparency and public engagement.

She reported that the first meeting of the Western Orbital scheme took place on 14 June 2016 where twenty three elected representatives had attended from communities affected by the scheme. Ten key issues were debated and resolutions adopted almost unanimously in every case, which she felt was a powerful representation of public opinion and collective resolve. She was therefore concerned as to how the views of the Local Liaison Forum fed into the decision making process and sought assurance from the Joint Assembly that these views would not simply be dismissed, particularly in view of the fact that Assembly Members did not currently receive minutes from these meetings and they did not form an agenda item for discussion at meetings of the Joint Assembly. Helen Bradbury therefore asked for consideration to be given to this issue.

Councillor Hickford referred to an item on delegated powers safeguards scheduled to be considered later at this meeting where it was recommended that the Chairman of each Local Liaison Forum be invited to speak at meetings of the Joint Assembly or Executive Board when consideration was being given to that particular scheme. He also requested that Members of the Joint Assembly and Board received notification of Local Liaison Forums meetings, together with copies of the minutes from those meetings. Councillor Hickford added that he would personally seek to attend as many Local Liaison Forums relating to City Deal schemes as he could.

## **5. PETITIONS**

No petitions had been received since the previous meeting.

## **6. SMART CAMBRIDGE: SMART CITY MANAGEMENT PLATFORM PROGRESS REPORT**

Consideration was given to a report which provided a progress update on the Smart City Management Platform that formed part of the Smart Cambridge project.

Noelle Godfrey, Programme Director of Connecting Cambridgeshire, presented the report and reminded Members that the aim of the Smart City Platform was to collect, process and make available data to help improve transport and reduce congestion in Greater Cambridge. She acknowledged that a vast amount of data already existed which could be collected, with the main problem being that it was neither joined up nor readily available for the public or professionals to use. The Smart City Platform would therefore seek to resolve this problem by:

- collecting transport and transport-related data from many existing and new sources;
- combining and processing this data;
- making this data readily available to the public, planners and other IT developers.

Noelle Godfrey reported that work to date had proceeded well and that the first project stream was already underway and would be complete by April 2017, with a second commencing in January 2017 and scheduled for completion in April 2018. A project plan and outline timescales was appended to the report.

Dr Ian Lewis, Director of Infrastructure and Investment at the University of Cambridge, took Members through a presentation appended to the report which provided an overview of the development of the Smart Cambridge Platform and the architecture associated with the platform. The following approach to achieve the project's objectives were noted:

- informing travellers about their travel choices. A portfolio of 'apps' for use by the public would emerge using data from the Smart Cambridge Platform itself through collaborative contributors in the region including the University of Cambridge and commercial partners;
- supporting intelligent planning of the transport infrastructure in the future. The Smart Cambridge Platform was already collecting the data which could contribute to a practical analysis of the impact of transport schemes and the richness of information would grow with time. The University of Cambridge would also exploit this data for research analysis, which could benefit the region;
- providing the framework within which the digitally connected city would evolve. There was ongoing discussion regarding other sensor data that would inevitably become available in the region, from air pollution data to cycling and footfall sensors and other traffic data. The platform was being designed from the outset to accommodate additional sources as they became available.

Anne Constantine asked whether this data had been used as part of the modelling undertaken on some of the transport infrastructure schemes. Dr Lewis confirmed that this data had not featured as part of the modelling used for City Deal schemes, but made the point that Local Authorities undertook their own modelling which required slightly different data.

Councillor Noel Kavanagh sought more explanation over the use of air quality sensors. Dr Lewis reported that 20 air quality sensors had been deployed which were able to be moved to certain locations in order that data could be collected to better understand the impact of traffic. This was taking place alongside other datasets that the project team felt would be of use and interest.

Councillor Dave Baigent asked whether this data would be sold to any third parties. He was also interested to see how this data could be fed back to communities to tell them accurately, for example, how long it would take to travel somewhere during rush hour. Noelle Godfrey reported that an 'app' would be produced for use by the general public. She also envisaged commercial providers using the data to improve their services and ultimately the services available to the public, making the point that by sharing the data other people could then use this to develop their own 'apps' and use the data how they wished. It was noted that this had occurred with other cities in the country. In terms of the selling of data, it was envisaged that it would not be sold at this stage but this was something the project team would need to consider as things developed.

Councillor Bridget Smith referred to a workshop that Members had attended in February 2016 where a presentation was given, following which she had been very excited about the prospects that the smart city workstream of the City Deal could deliver. She was slightly underwhelmed with this report, however, in the context of that presentation and sought an assurance that the aspirations set out in February were still achievable. Noelle Godfrey responded by saying that the presentation had outlined what could potentially be achieved overall in due course, with this report being the first detailed progress report on implementation of the project to date. She made the point that these things were aspirational and leading edge and could not therefore be delivered in such short timescales, but emphasised that the aspirations set out in February were still there.

Sir Michael Marshall asked whether the data being collected could be used to confirm bus occupancy and also provide information on the reasoning behind congestion problems or bottlenecks. He also questioned whether postcode data was being collected from employers to ascertain where employees lived in order that their commutes could be tracked to better understand where they were travelling to and from. Noelle Godfrey confirmed that bus occupancy would not feature as part of this first stage but the team was looking into how this could be undertaken. Reasons for congestion or bottlenecks were recorded in terms of them happening but not necessarily the reasoning behind them. She also confirmed that other projects of the City Deal had already begun contacting employers in the way that Sir Michael had described.

Helen Valentine asked whether the finances available to the project were constraining its delivery in any way. Noelle Godfrey explained that this workstream was established as a very lean programme and in some ways benefited from being more nimble as a result. She cited examples of other cities that had committed millions of pounds for big systems to support smart city solutions which themselves had not been able to deliver the required outcomes and said that resourcing was not the only answer.

Claire Ruskin made the point that communication of some of the key benefits associated with this workstream would be very important.

Councillor Hickford informed the Joint Assembly that Members would be invited to a demonstration of the datasets associated with this piece of work and that they would also be given access to a portal in order that they could view the data.

The Joint Assembly:

- (a) **NOTED** progress to date.
- (b) **NOTED** the forward plan for delivery of the first phase.

## **7. SMART CAMBRIDGE: FIRST STEPS TOWARDS INTELLIGENT MOBILITY**

The Joint Assembly considered a report to seek endorsement and subsequent approval by the Executive Board to pursue three research and investigative work packages at a cost of £90,000 in respect of intelligent mobility.

Noelle Godfrey, Programme Director for Connecting Cambridgeshire, presented the report and reminded Members that intelligent mobility had been defined as 'the convergence of digital industries, transport infrastructure, vehicles and users to provide innovative services relating to different modes of transport and traffic management'. The three packages proposed for further research or investigation included:

- research and data gathering about why people made specific transport choices in the Greater Cambridge area;
- investigate the current legislative, commercial and other barriers and opportunities with regards to integrated ticketing and online ticket purchase in Greater Cambridge;
- conduct an initial feasibility study on the potential of running autonomous vehicle trials, using the unique aspects of the guided busway.

Councillor Bridget Smith, in respect of the first bullet point, had assumed that this kind of research had already been undertaken as part of the early work in respect of transport infrastructure schemes and the recommended use of bus lanes. She made the point that

officers had consistently said that people would use buses if the infrastructure was improved, so questioned how they could make such a claim if they did not yet have the evidence. In terms of modal shift, Councillor Smith made the point that engagement with people who had already made the change needed to take place, rather than with those people who indicated that they would make the change in the future.

Noelle Godfrey reported that the proposal in the report came from extensive research undertaken by the Department for Transport and other key stakeholders about pinch-points for travellers, particularly in respect of multi-modal journeys. She was therefore keen to correlate that for the Greater Cambridge area, particularly in view of the fact that a significant number of people cycled in Cambridge and its surrounding areas.

With 12 votes in favour and 2 against, the Joint Assembly:

- (a) **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board approves the following three work packages:
- (i) research and data-gathering about why people make specific transport choices in the Greater Cambridge area;
  - (ii) investigating the current legislative, commercial and other barriers and opportunities with regards to integrated ticketing and on-line ticket purchase in Greater Cambridge;
  - (iii) conducting an initial feasibility study on the potential of running autonomous vehicle trials, using the unique aspects of the guided busway.
- (b) **NOTED** that in early 2017 the Board will be recommended to approve a fourth work-package, to support better digital way-finding in the City and to improve the experience of the travelling public for leisure, business and tourism purposes.

*NOTE – Helen Valentine left the meeting at this stage of proceedings.*

## 8. **SIX MONTHLY REPORT ON THE GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL SKILLS SERVICE**

The Joint Assembly considered a report which provided Members with a six month update on the progress of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Skills Service.

Stella Cockerill, Skills and Careers Enterprise Manager at the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership, presented the report. She highlighted that the role of the Skills Service was to help achieve the City Deal objectives of promoting an additional 420 apprenticeships over the first five years of the Deal in areas aligned to Greater Cambridge's growth sectors, and generally support the employability of young people. It was noted that the Skills Service contract commenced on 1 September 2015 with the contract focussing on the following areas:

- delivering events and activities that provided young people with information on the local economy and expectations of employers;
- delivering apprenticeships events and providing information relating to apprenticeships to employers, young people, parents and staff in schools;
- engaging employers and connecting them to schools and apprenticeship providers;
- supporting the development of strategic relationships between schools and employers.

Stella Cockerill outlined the types of activities that had been undertaken in support of the above and reported that baseline recommendations for monitoring the progress towards the additional 420 apprenticeships had been set with the following parameters and in consultation with the Joint Assembly Skills Working Group, with 2014 serving as the baseline year:

- apprenticeship starts for young people and adults had been included, recognising that the Skills Service focused on young people but that the apprenticeship target was not age specific;
- progress against target included apprenticeship starts where the delivery location was within Cambridge or South Cambridgeshire;
- the sectors to be included in calculating the total target were set out in the report;
- the way in which the delivery of apprenticeships was delivered and monitored may need to evolve in the light of broader changes in skills policy. For example, Area Based Reviews would begin in December 2016 and as part of this the Local Enterprise Partnership would produce an economic assessment and skills conclusion, which could lead to changing those sectors determined as priorities. In addition, in April 2017 the apprenticeship frameworks would be replaced with the new apprenticeship standards, which would have to be developed and approved by employers. It would then be necessary to decide which of the new standards would be included in the targets.

Councillor Tim Bick reflected on the work of the Joint Assembly's Working Group and said that a lot of its work so far had been determining the definition of what was meant by the specific target of 420 additional apprenticeships. He said that it had not been a simple matter to define the baseline and outlined the complexities that had been experienced with the stem subjects and how they were counted by the area the apprentice lived, where the training provider was based or the location of the employer. Councillor Bick referred to the table in the report which provided a trajectory of apprenticeship schemes that had commenced in 2014 and 2015. He reported that this demonstrated apprenticeships in stem subjects were moving in the right direction but not yet at a rate fast enough to meet the target of 420.

Councillor Bick said that the skills agenda was further complicated by the imminent Area Based Review and the result of the EU Referendum, with uncertainty about investment in the area and a potential skills shortage in the future being key issues. He was of the view that more could be done to engage with employers to stimulate apprenticeship schemes where they did not currently exist, clearly identifying the benefits that apprenticeships could provide to their businesses. Councillor Bick felt that the Executive Board should be alerted to the fact that it may need to consider putting in place additional funding or resources to ensure that the target of 420 additional apprenticeships was met. He also wanted the Assembly to urge the Board to continue the work of the Joint Assembly Skills Working Group.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, was pleased that the target had been included in the Deal, which he felt would mean it would be achieved, and made the point that the aspiration should be to achieve more than that. He also supported the continuation of the Working Group, which currently had Councillor Tim Bick, Councillor Noel Kavanagh, Claire Ruskin and Andy Williams as Members from the Assembly who had indicated that they would all be prepared carry on its work.

Councillor Bridget Smith appreciated that the target related to 420 new apprenticeships, but was concerned about drop out rates and asked how that element was being monitored. She also questioned the perceived lack of engineering apprenticeships

referred to in the figures for 2014 and 2015. Councillor Smith highlighted that this was a very good piece of work for the City Deal and called for more to be done to make it known to the public.

In terms of branding, Councillor Smith was keen for it to be made clear which apprenticeships or services were provided or funded as part of the City Deal and called for the City Deal to have its own branding in this respect. Stella Cockerill reported that logos had already been designed and that branding would state specific apprenticeship schemes had been delivered by Form the Future and funded by the City Deal. Councillor Hickford suggested that the Work Group should consider this issue further.

Referring to the point about drop out rates, Stella Cockerill confirmed that the completion rate for apprenticeship schemes in the county was 71%, with the figures in the report relating solely to the no of apprenticeship schemes that had commenced in 2014 and 2015.

Councillor Noel Kavanagh was pleased to see that so many local business had engaged with the Skills Service and was interested to know whether they were from the sectors that the City Deal was targeting. Stella Cockerill stated that the Skills Services was looking to promote pathways to areas of activity where there was not a large amount of apprenticeship activity, through a broad range of sectors.

The Joint Assembly unanimously:

- (a) **NOTED** the progress of the service to date and its achievement against key performance indicators.
- (b) **NOTED** that the November six monthly report will share the findings from the interim evaluation and ask the Board to consider the future funding position for the service.
- (c) **NOTED** the significant changes that are due from April 2017 with respect to the transformation of apprenticeships (the shift from apprenticeship frameworks to employer led apprenticeship standards) and the introduction of the employer apprenticeship levy.
- (d) **RECOMMENDED** the continuation of the Joint Assembly Skills Working Group, with any necessary additional resources allocated to it to support the Group's work.

## 9. **MONITORING DELIVERY OF 1,000 EXTRA NEW HOMES ON RURAL EXCEPTION SITES**

The Joint Assembly considered a report which set out how a commitment in the City Deal to provide 1,000 additional dwellings on rural exception sites by 2031, in addition to the accelerated delivery of 33,480 homes, was progressing and the way it would be monitored.

Caroline Hunt, Planning Policy Manager at South Cambridgeshire District Council, presented the report and explained that the City Deal commitment was for homes on rural exception sites, which was in the context of another commitment to accelerate delivery of 33,480 planned homes at the time of the agreement. As this was coincident with the 33,500 homes requirement for Greater Cambridge as part of Local Plans for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, only once delivery exceeded the level to meet the Local Plan requirement could any eligible homes be counted towards the 1,000 additional home commitment. It was therefore necessary to define the developments that comprised as

eligible sites for the purposes of monitoring the Councils' performance against the City Deal agreement.

Caroline Hunt referred to the report and advised that developments of traditional rural exception sites were currently not coming forward due to a lack of five year housing land supply. She highlighted, however, that what was coming forward were developments in rural areas as exceptions to normal policy, which included an element of affordable housing as well as additional housing generally to meet the needs of the area. Under the circumstances it was proposed that eligible sites be considered to be traditional rural exception sites and five year supply sites.

The Joint Assembly was referred Members to the appendices of the report which set out a list of eligible sites using this definition, as published in housing trajectory for 2015, together with predicted completions from eligible planning permissions permitted since the housing trajectory up to June 2016. It was noted that on this basis 430 homes on top of planned housing growth could now be included towards the City Deal's commitment of 1,000 additional dwellings, with a further 170 dwellings having recently received planning permission that would also be eligible.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, made the point that examination of the submitted Local Plans had been suspended with a significant number of speculative planning applications being submitted. He was concerned that developments resulting from these applications in rural areas were being classed as being within rural exception sites for the purpose of meeting this City Deal objective.

Caroline Hunt explained that the adoption of the Local Plan would resolve the lack of five year housing land supply but that in the interim period the Council would remain open to speculative applications, but was taking all possible steps to deal with that situation as robustly as possible.

Councillor Hickford said he understood that the City Deal's commitment was for 1,000 additional homes on rural exception sites and that these should all therefore be affordable homes. He did not think this was being delivered and felt that the original commitment was being interpreted in another way, which was not in the spirit of what was intended.

Councillor Bridget Smith agreed with Councillor Hickford and was of the opinion that the figures were being manipulated. She reiterated that Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire was vulnerable to speculative planning applications and in South Cambridgeshire 50% of those refused by the Council's Planning Committee had been approved on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate. In terms of the City Deal commitment, the 1,000 additional homes were included on the basis of being in rural exception sites and consisting of 100% affordable housing expressly for the use of people living in the community and not for general housing need. Councillor Smith said that what was being proposed in the report was to accept the smaller proportion of affordable housing from developments that were not wanted, with the majority of dwellings being market housing, and have these count towards the City Deal's additional 1,000 homes commitment. She strongly opposed this proposal and claimed that the report had redefined what rural exception sites represented, which were about meeting local needs.

Councillor Kevin Price supported Councillor Smith's comments and was concerned that the definition of rural exception sites contained in the Council's affordable housing supplementary planning document would be changed by the proposed approach.

Caroline Hunt explained that the sites suggested in the report were market led but that they did include elements of affordable housing, many at levels of 40% of affordable

housing. She accepted that these developments had resulted from speculative planning applications, so were not planned, but reiterated that they would deliver affordable housing in rural areas. Caroline Hunt said that it was expected that applications for traditional rural exception sites would be submitted again once the Local Plan had been adopted.

Discussion ensued on whether, in the interim period, all of the dwellings in these developments should count towards the City Deal's commitment, or whether this should be limited to solely the affordable homes associated with these developments. Councillor Maurice Leeke highlighted a third option which was to include none of them, since none of the developments fell under the category of rural exception sites.

Councillor Tim Wotherspoon made the point that circumstances since the City Deal document was originally signed had changed and saw the logic of extending the definition as proposed in the report. In his view, all that mattered was that more houses were able to be built in order to accommodate more people in the interests of growing the economy.

Alex Colyer, Executive Director at South Cambridgeshire District Council, made the point that the Government's challenge at the time of the City Deal negotiations was not in relation to affordable homes but delivery of 1,000 additional homes over and above those set out in the Local Plans. He added that it had been the Council that had suggested rural exception sites as being the only option available at that time given the stage in the Local Plan process.

Councillor Hickford, in response, referred to paragraph 11 of the report which stated that 'the City Deal agreement was for 1,000 homes on rural exception sites', so thought it would be useful to inspect the City Deal agreement document to confirm the City Deal's commitment with regard to this issue.

Further discussion took place on the developments set out in the appendix to the report and whether they should be counted towards the City Deal's commitment. The Chairman asked Members to signify whether they would support the inclusion of only those affordable homes in the developments outlined in the appendix as being an appropriate definition of eligible homes for the 1,000 additional homes on rural exception sites as part of the City Deal's commitment. Five Members signified that they would be in favour, four Members signified that they would be against and four Members abstained. It was subsequently agreed that the Chairman should present the concerns raised at this meeting to the Executive Board.

The Joint Assembly unanimously:

- (a) **NOTED** progress towards delivery.
- (b) **REQUESTED** that the Chairman of the Joint Assembly reports the concerns raised by Members of the Assembly at this meeting to the Executive Board in relation to the definition of rural exception sites for the purposes of monitoring the City Deal commitment.

## 10. **GREATER CAMBRIDGE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AGENCY PROGRESS REPORT**

Consideration was given to a report which provided an update on progress with the establishment and development of the Housing Development Agency.

Alan Carter, Managing Director of the Housing Development Agency, presented the report which provided information on the Agency's objectives, the changing environment as a result of the introduction of the Housing and Planning Act, achievements since the

summer 2015 and the way in which the Agency operated in terms of its customers, its geography, how it added value and its unique selling point. It also set out the land, scheme fees and operational budget and the Agency's approach to the recruitment, retention and deployment of staff capacity, knowledge, skills and experience that it needed.

Mr Carter reported that the existing programme up to 2018/19 consisted of approximately 800 to 820 homes, with progress in relation to those schemes set out in the appendix to the report. Section 8 of the appendix outlined the strategy for delivering these schemes based on the following four themes:

- working with strategic housing and planning colleagues to understand the range of new housing needed in terms of tenure;
- optimising partner land opportunities;
- working on funding models and testing the viability of mixed tenure schemes;
- working with partners whose ambitions were aligned with the Greater Cambridge 'growth' agenda including other landowners.

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the report.

## 11. **OUTTURN REPORT FOR FINANCIAL YEAR ENDING 31 MARCH 2016**

The Joint Assembly considered a report which provided Members with the outturn monitoring position for the financial year ending 31 March 2016.

Chris Malyon, Chief Finance Officer at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report.

Councillor Dave Baigent asked whether the costs associated with transport infrastructure schemes included any construction costs. Mr Malyon confirmed that the costings in the report did not include any construction costs and solely reflected the amount spent on developing each respective scheme.

The Joint Assembly:

- (a) **NOTED** the position of the Operational Budget and the Programme Budget for the 2015/16 financial year.
- (b) **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board approves the proposed Operational Budget to be carried forward into the 2016/17 financial year, as set out in section 4.2.1 of the report.

## 12. **FINANCIAL MONITORING MAY 2016**

Consideration was given to a report which provided the Joint Assembly with the financial monitoring position for the period ending 31 May 2016.

Chris Malyon, Chief Finance Officer at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report and explained that the original commitment was to provide reports on a quarterly basis. Unfortunately, due to the timing and cycle of meetings for the Joint Assembly and Executive Board, the information being reported upon was out of date by the time it was considered at the respective meetings. Mr Malyon therefore suggested providing all Members of the Joint Assembly and Executive Board with a copy of future monitoring reports via email as soon as they were available, as well as publishing them on the City

Deal Website, on a monthly basis with them being formally considered at the appropriate meeting cycle. The Joint Assembly unanimously supported this approach.

It was noted that a detailed report on the City Deal's Financial Strategy would be reported to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in October.

The Joint Assembly:

- (a) **NOTED** the financial position as at 31 May 2016.
- (b) **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board approves an increase to the budgetary provision for the current financial year as set out in section 4.2.4 of the report.

### 13. **GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL DELEGATED POWERS SAFEGUARDS**

The Joint Assembly considered a report which set out the proposed process to be adopted to ensure consultation took place with local residents, local elected Members and other stakeholders in the development and implementation of powers delegated by Cambridgeshire County Council as the Highways Authority.

Graham Hughes, Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report and referred Members to the consultation and engagement principles, the terms of reference for Local Liaison Forums and the City Deal delivery process for larger schemes, all of which were attached as appendices.

The Joint Assembly unanimously:

- (a) **NOTED** that the Executive Board agreed to adopt the consultation and engagement principles of Cambridgeshire County Council at its meeting on 9 June 2016.
- (b) **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board confirms the establishment of Local Liaison Forums for each significant City Deal scheme to develop the detailed proposals for consultation prior to statutory consultation on the Traffic Regulation Orders.
- (c) **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board confirms that all local elected Members from the three partner authorities, whose electoral Divisions or Wards are within the geography of the scheme(s) in question, will be invited to be members of the Local Liaison Forum, as set out in the published terms of reference for Local Liaison Forums.
- (d) **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board confirms that local elected Members and members of the public will be able to ask questions in respect of Traffic Regulation Orders at the Joint Assembly and Executive Board.
- (e) **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board agrees to invite the Chairman of each Local Liaison Forum to speak at the Joint Assembly and Executive Board when consideration is being given to that particular scheme.

**14. CITY DEAL PROGRESS REPORT**

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, presented the City Deal progress report.

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the progress report.

**15. CITY DEAL FORWARD PLAN**

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, presented the City Deal Forward Plan.

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the Forward Plan.

---

**The Meeting ended at 6.03 p.m.**

---