



GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL EXECUTIVE BOARD

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board held on
Wednesday, 13 July 2016 at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board:

Councillor Lewis Herbert	Cambridge City Council (Chairman)
Councillor Francis Burkitt	South Cambridgeshire District Council (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Ian Bates	Cambridgeshire County Council
Mark Reeve	Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership
Professor Nigel Slater	University of Cambridge

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

Councillor Tim Bick	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Roger Hickford	Cambridgeshire County Council and Chairman of the Joint Assembly
Claire Ruskin	Cambridge Network
Councillor Bridget Smith	South Cambridgeshire District Council

Officers/advisors:

Stephen Kelly	Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council
Andrew Limb	Cambridge City Council
Graham Hughes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Aaron Blowers	City Deal Partnership
Beth Durham	City Deal Partnership
Joanna Harrall	City Deal Partnership
Noelle Godfrey	Connecting Cambridgeshire Partnership
Tanya Sherdian	City Deal Partnership
Neil Darwin	Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership
Alan Carter	Housing Development Agency
Alex Colyer	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Caroline Hunt	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Graham Watts	South Cambridgeshire District Council

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence had been received.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 9 June 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record, subject to the inclusion of reference to a question submitted by John Latham in relation to Milton Road under item 11.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

4. QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

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

Question by Antony Carpen

Antony Carpen asked what plans the City Deal authorities had in place for organising events specifically targeted at young people, such as children at schools and colleges, and how they planned on improving the coordination of consultations with other important consultations going out at the same time, such as the consultation on devolution in Cambridgeshire and site specific works like the Chisholm Trail.

In addition, he asked whether Councils would be receptive to community groups and individuals that wanted to host consultation events in Council owned buildings and waive booking fees for such public meetings.

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, reported that the City Deal Partnership was using parent mail in respect of young people at schools to ensure that children and parents were aware of the City Deal's key messages and updates. Social media was also being used more widely to ensure that a broader audience could be reached. She agreed that this group of people was a very important audience and said that the Partnership aspired to increase engagement in this respect.

In terms of consultations, Tanya Sheridan reported that the three partner Councils did liaise with one another in respect of the publication and launch of consultations to ensure that, where possible, they did not clash and that they were coordinated. She added her support, in principle, to community events but highlighted that there would be costs that needed covering in terms of facilities, especially after working hours.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, agreed that there needed to be wider engagement with young people and said that he would be willing to meet with Mr Carpen to discuss putting together an event focussed on young people and how this issue could be taken forward. Professor Nigel Slater added that the University would support such an event if it took place.

Question by Wendy Blythe

Wendy Blythe referred to the meeting of the Joint Assembly held on 7 July 2016 in respect of the Smart Cambridge project where Dr Ian Lewis of the University of Cambridge was quoted as saying "we will know whether building a bus lane down Milton Road actually improves the journeys of the bus on the road or not".

Additionally, Wendy Blythe made reference 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.”

Wendy Blythe said that other ideas could include investment in rail, regional travel hubs, smart traffic signals and greater investment in South Cambridge projects to collect high quality data and provide personalised travel information. She therefore asked what the Board's response was to the call from the Greater Cambridge community for spending the money not on bus lanes, but on some of these other ideas which the whole community could support.

Graham Hughes, Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, said that he and his colleagues had consistently said to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board that the City Deal transport schemes needed to balance a range of measures which, in his view, had to include bus priorities in order to achieve the objective of improved journey times and reliability. He referred to the list of ideas cited above, giving an assurance that all of those elements were already being looked into. Mr Hughes highlighted that the Board had supported two rail schemes in the area even though they were not City Deal schemes, and supported use of smarter traffic signals making the point that their use would be considered as part of any transport infrastructure schemes as they were developed. He said that such a measure was not in itself a solution and each scheme needed to embrace a balance, adding that a range of key projects were happening with these aspects developing further as the programme moved forward.

Councillor Herbert reiterated that the City Deal Partnership was either doing these things already or helping to deliver them. He said that the main purpose of bus lanes was to give priority to buses at junctions and accepted that further discussion and engagement with the community would be helpful on this issue, perhaps later in the year.

Professor Nigel Slater commended the system that Dr Ian Lewis from the University of Cambridge was working on, explaining that the data it had already collected could confirm how long individual bus journeys took on specific routes at particular times of the day. This would eventually be developed into a system that could predict the time that buses would arrive at their destinations with complete accuracy. He added that the more data and knowledge that could be collected, the more the information and system would develop and improve.

Councillor Ian Bates reiterated the points about Cambridge North and Cambridge South stations, adding that a proposed link from Bedford to Cambridge had also seen a lot of interest, confirming that these projects were being developed with Network Rail.

Councillor Francis Burkitt repeated the Chairman's comments in that the City Deal Partnership was already doing the things suggested as part of the question. He was very keen to see the introduction of the Cambridge South railway station and also supported the Foxton rail crossing. In terms of regional travel hubs, Councillor Burkitt reported that he had very recently contacted all Parish Councils in South Cambridgeshire to ask for their ideas in their respective areas for regional travel hubs, confirming that he had already receiving some responses.

Question by Jean Glasberg

Jean Glasberg referred to a question she asked at the meeting of the Joint Assembly on 2 June 2016 and the Urban Design Guide for transport infrastructure schemes. She had asked whether the City Deal would be conducting a skills analysis to ensure that the teams who would deliver the programme had the full range of competencies necessary to

deliver good place making and sustainable development, as well as functional transport infrastructure, and had been assured that this was already in place.

Consultation was already underway on the improvements to Trumpington Road, which she appreciated was not a City Deal scheme, but she said that there seemed to be little awareness of design issues in this environmentally sensitive conservation area. She referred to the lead officers being listed as a traffic engineer and two cycling officers and asked, therefore, where the input from architects, landscape and urban designers was as part of this.

Councillor Bates confirmed that this was not a City Deal scheme and was a scheme being developed by Cambridgeshire County Council. He extended an invitation to meet with Jean Glasberg and other people in the community in order that any landscaping issues or concerns could be highlighted and taken into account as part of developing the scheme.

Question by Barbara Taylor

Barbara Taylor referred to the recently launched public consultation document on tackling peak time congestion in Cambridge and asked exactly where in the leaflet and questionnaire it mentioned that bus lanes were being proposed.

Mr Hughes explained that bus priorities were part of the overall package and would be included as part of the consultation processes for individual transport infrastructure schemes. They were not included in the city centre consultation referred to in the question as they did not feature as part of that specific scheme. He acknowledged, however, that communicating the City Deal's overall vision was something that the City Deal Partnership should reflect upon.

Councillor Herbert made the point that a number of exhibitions and events were being held where discussion could take place in order to obtain a better understanding of the objectives behind the radial route proposals and proposals for the city centre. Documentation would also be available at key information points in the Greater Cambridge area to ensure that members of the public had the opportunity to be informed.

Question by Gerry Rose

Gerry Rose said that a question to the Board on 9 June 2016 raised important matters about the published data files for the Milton Road and Histon Road consultations, where it was reported that the submissions from individuals, residents' associations and other groups were provided on the City Deal website in a PDF image format that was not searchable. At that meeting officials had promised that he would receive a written response to the question, but Mr Rose reported that he had not heard anything. He therefore asked what progress had been made on this issue, why it was taking so long to resolve and whether officers could at least publish on the website their own in-house summaries of submissions in order that residents could understand how the data had been utilised.

Councillor Herbert offered his apologies to Mr Rose for the lack of a response on this issue.

Tanya Sheridan also apologised and reported that this process had taken much longer than anticipated, with various IT issues leading to the delay. She committed to ensure that Mr Rose would receive an update on progress within a week.

In terms of officer summaries, it was noted that these had already been published on the City Deal website and were done so at the same time as publication of the agenda and papers for meetings of the Joint Assembly and Executive Board, which contained the report from officers on the outcomes of the consultation.

Question by Michael Page

Michael Page referred to a question submitted at the previous meeting of the Board which did not appear to have been answered in relation to the Milton Road transport infrastructure scheme. He said that public opinion had been ignored in respect of the Milton Road and Elizabeth Road roundabout and suggestions for the roundabout to be redesigned for safety reasons, adding that in the meantime the County Council had published a Dutch-style redesign of the Fendon Road and Queen Edith Way roundabout to improve safety. Mr Page therefore asked why the City Deal had ignored public opinion and not given any detailed evidence or rationale in favour of replacing the roundabout with traffic lights and why consultants were not commissioned to design Dutch-style or signal controlled roundabouts as alternative options as the Council had seen fit to do for Fendon Road.

Mr Hughes confirmed that the general principle, in terms of safety from the perspective of cyclists, was that traffic signals were much safer than roundabouts. However, the judgment from officers at the time in relation to the Milton Road and Elizabeth Way roundabout was that preference should be given to any option which balanced bus priority and cycle safety. He made the point that it was impossible to satisfy everyone's needs and views and that judgments therefore needed to be made as schemes developed.

Councillor Herbert said that this was a design issue that would need to be taken into consideration, in terms of whether a roundabout or an alternative solution was appropriate. He asked Mr Page to ensure that he contacted officers outside of the meeting to ensure that they were fully aware of the issues relating to this part of the scheme. Councillor Herbert also referred to Local Liaison Forums which he saw as an opportunity for members of the public to put forward their views on issues such as this.

Councillor Burkitt reflected on two meetings of the Local Liaison Forum in relation to the A428 scheme that he had attended. He was disappointed that senior transport officers from the County Council had not been in attendance and felt that residents and elected Members would benefit from having either the Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment, the Director of Strategy and Development or the Head of Major Infrastructure Delivery in attendance at future meetings of all Local Liaison Forums for City Deal schemes.

Mr Hughes responded by saying that they would certainly aim to do that. In terms of the information made available for transport infrastructure schemes, he highlighted that lots of technical work supported those reports made publicly available, which also informed the recommendations contained within them. Mr Hughes acknowledged that consideration may need to be given to the way in which reports were written and information was presented. He added that Local Liaison Forums for previous transport schemes had been established at a much later stage of the process whereas for City Deal schemes it had been decided to involve them at a much earlier stage. It was accepted, therefore, that officers were developing the way they worked in that context, but Mr Hughes made the point that he would seek to create a much more open dialogue through workshops and exhibitions where the rationale and objectives of schemes could be better explained, together with explaining how specific recommendations had been reached.

Question by Helen Bradbury

Helen Bradbury was the Chair of the Local Liaison Forum for the A428 and Western Orbital schemes and questioned how the Local Liaison Forum fed into the decision making process, together with the timings of Forum meetings and how new information required for them was shared by officers.

She reported that her first meetings of her Local Liaison Forums were held on 14 June 2016 where twenty three elected representatives were in attendance at a packed community hall. Ten issues were debated and resolutions adopted, almost unanimous in every case, and it was her opinion that this was a powerful representation of public opinion and collective resolve. She therefore sought confirmation as to what happened next.

Helen Bradbury understood that the minutes of Local Liaison Forums were reported to the Project Board for which there did not appear to be any reporting or communication structure set out in the Forum's terms of reference. It was therefore a concern of hers that these resolutions passed would simply be dismissed when officer recommendations were made and therefore recommended that the Chair of the Local Liaison Forum be invited to attend the Project Board meeting to report the views of the Forum. She asked whether the Executive Board supported this recommendation and also whether the Board would instruct officers to work with the Forum to ensure that meetings were timed to take place before meetings of the Joint Assembly and that all new information was proactively shared in order that the Forum's views could contribute to those debates.

Helen Bradbury also referred to the Joint Assembly meeting scheduled to be held on 25 August 2016 where she understood the A428 transport infrastructure scheme would be considered and asked whether the Local Liaison Forum Chair would be invited to attend and comment on the preferred options before any recommendations were made. She was keen to receive information prior to 15 August 2016 in order that there was sufficient time to canvass views of members and prepare an adequate response.

Mr Hughes referred to the previous question and reiterated the point that Local Liaison Forums for City Deal schemes were being introduced at a much earlier stage than in previous transport schemes, so officers were still considering how they could most effectively operate. He confirmed that the Executive Board was the decision making body in respect of City Deal schemes, making the point that the Project Board was an informal officer-level group which developed proposals and which elected Members did not attend. He did not think that this was the relevant group for Chairs of Local Liaison Forums to attend and raise issues, suggesting that discussions or recommendations arising from Forum meetings should be fed into the Joint Assembly and Executive Board by the Chair being able to attend and present those views.

In terms of the timing of information being made available and the programme of meetings for the Local Liaison Forum, Joint Assembly and Executive Board meetings, officers needed to undertake some work to ensure that this was properly aligned.

Councillor Francis Burkitt asked whether the A428 scheme, originally proposed for considered at the Joint Assembly on 25 August 2016 and subsequently the Board, was being pushed back. Mr Hughes said that initial work had been undertaken which had highlighted the need for significant further work to be carried out and which could potentially result in a revised reporting timetable for the scheme.

Question by Mal Schofield

Mal Schofield was not in attendance to ask his question, which related to bus lanes. He had asked at this late stage whether the Board would consider it prudent to test the hypothesis that bus lanes improved public transport perceptions of reliability to the extent that significant commuting by car would occur. Additionally he asked, should not the measures already approved to discourage peak hour car travel together with the proposed behavioural research on travel choice take priority.

The Executive Board noted the question and in the absence of the questioner officers were asked to provide a written response.

5. PETITIONS

No petitions had been received since the previous meeting.

6. JOINT ASSEMBLY MEMBERSHIP

The Executive Board **AGREED** to the co-option of Mark Robertson, Interim Principal of Cambridge Regional College, onto the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly in place of Anne Constantine as a nominee of the University of Cambridge.

The Executive Board **APPOINTED** Dr Jason Matthews, Director of the Estate Strategy at the University of Cambridge, as the University's substitute/alternate Member on the Board, in place of Roger Taylor.

7. REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE JOINT ASSEMBLY

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, confirmed that he would provide a report on the Assembly's recommendations further to its meeting on 7 July 2016 at the relevant item on the agenda for this meeting.

8. SMART CAMBRIDGE: SMART CITY MANAGEMENT PLATFORM PROGRESS REPORT

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

Noelle Godfrey, Programme Director of Connecting Cambridgeshire, presented the report and reminded Members of the Board 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. It was emphasised that this project involved use of leading edge technology and as a result the very nature of its work was experimental. 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.

It was 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 were appended to the report.

Noelle Godfrey referred to a presentation provided by Dr Ian Lewis, Director of Infrastructure and Investment at the University of Cambridge, which he gave to the Joint Assembly meeting on 7 July 2016. A copy was appended to the report which provided an overview of the development of the Smart Cambridge Platform and the architecture associated with it. The following approach to achieve the project's objectives was noted:

- informing travellers about their travel choices. A portfolio of 'apps' for use by the public would emerge and be provided by 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. The Smart Cambridge Platform was already collecting the data necessary for a detailed 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 designed from the outset to accommodate additional sources as they became available.

Councillor Roger Hickford reported that the Joint Assembly had considered this report at its meeting on 7 July 2016 and that the officer recommendations had been overwhelmingly supported. Members of the Assembly had questioned whether data could be sold to interested third parties and also questioned whether the relatively small amount of funding in the context of the City Deal programme placed any constraint on delivery of the project. The Assembly had also agreed that communication of the key benefits of this project should be improved in order that people knew more about what was being proposed as part of this important piece of work. Councillor Hickford highlighted that all Members of the Joint Assembly would be offered a demonstration of the data sets and a portal would be available in order to access the data.

Councillor Francis Burkitt recalled that £300,000 had been invested in this project, but noted from the financial monitoring report that none of this had been spent to date. Noelle Godfrey confirmed that most of the expenditure was back-loaded in the project, with the early work packages including mainly preparatory work. Some funding had been spent to date but this had not yet been billed. In terms of the Assembly's question regarding the level of funding being adequate to support the project, it was noted that funding for the project's current plans was on track but that if the scope changed it may be necessary to consider further funding, which would be debated at the appropriate time. Noelle Godfrey added that simply adding financial resource to a project did not always bring forward the best solutions.

Reflecting on the staffing resources allocated to the project, Councillor Burkitt sought clarification that 0.7 fulltime equivalents from two officers were working on this project, with support of other contributors such as the University of Cambridge. Given the importance of this project, he was concerned about the risk this exposed the Board to and questioned whether enough officer resource was being allocated to the project. Noelle Godfrey confirmed that dedicated officer time did currently equate to 0.7 fulltime equivalents but

made the point that, although the project was lean, it worked collaboratively and benefited from contributions from all City Deal partners and beyond.

In answer to a question regarding the envisaged release date for the 'app', it was noted that the 'app' had to be released in a test format to better appreciate and determine how much work and additional resource may be required and how many iterations of the 'app' might be needed. The more detailed design work would take place during phase two of the project so it was not possible at this stage to confirm a proposed released date.

Councillor Burkitt welcomed the 'app' but was concerned that this was the only thing that members of the public would be able to use as a result of this project. He referred to other smart city measures that he had used in other cities in the country, such as digital code inputs to establish the next scheduled bus arrival in London and digital display screens at bus stops in Basingstoke showing real-time bus journeys. Councillor Burkitt wanted to see all bus stops have real-time display screens introduced and also felt that traffic lights should automatically turn green when buses approached the signal. He questioned what other similar initiatives had been considered and whether any further thought was being given to them.

Noelle Godfrey explained that the 'app' was one way of ensuring that information was put out to the general public, but said that there were many other ways of sharing information as well. Various mechanisms were already in place that provided information to people, but the real question was what data were they providing and was it the right data. She reported that analysis on this issue had already commenced.

In terms of traffic lights, it was noted that this sat within other workstreams of the City Deal. Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, confirmed that bus priority traffic lights were being looked into as part of City Deal schemes in terms of bus priority and capacity objectives. Councillor Burkitt was keen to see the introduction of automatic green lights at traffic signals for all buses as a blanket approach, rather than solely on specific schemes. Graham Hughes, Executive Director for Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, explained that such a proposal was not as simple as it appeared. He said that each junction would need to be looked at separately to establish the implications of such a measure in terms of balancing the movement of traffic and understanding its effect. He therefore felt that a blanket approach would be the wrong thing to introduce, but welcomed the introduction of such a measure on any junction where it was right to do so.

Mark Reeve welcomed the question in respect of resourcing and was of the opinion that the project was underfunded and under-resourced, adding that if Cambridge really wanted to become a smart city the City Deal should be investing more time and resources. Councillor Herbert noted the concern but made the point that this was a start, that the partnership with the University was very good and that it would be important to build on this.

Councillor Ian Bates made reference to a leaflet that had been produced in respect of the Smart Cambridge project, highlighting in particular a page which set out the significant number of contributors from a range of sectors that was involved in the project.

Professor Nigel Slater made the point that the City Deal Partnership was already competing with other smart cities in the country and that this workstream was not behind in any way. He added that the project could result in the selling of data or systems.

The Executive Board:

- (a) **NOTED** the progress to date.
- (b) **NOTED** the forward plan for the delivery of the first phase.
- (c) **AGREED** that Councillor Francis Burkitt and Professor Nigel Slater would lead on this project on behalf of the Executive Board.

9. **SMART CAMBRIDGE: FIRST STEPS TOWARDS INTELLIGENT MOBILITY**

Consideration was given to a report which sought approval to pursue three research and investigative work packages at a cost of £90,000 to inform future thinking and highlighted a fourth work package for which a separate proposal would follow in early 2017.

Noelle Godfrey, Programme Director at Connecting Cambridgeshire, presented the report and highlighted 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' and that this work was separate to but complemented the Smart City programme.

It was proposed that the following three work packages were undertaken in the first instance, which spanned the key aspects of intelligent mobility noted as being access, automation, demand and supply and integration:

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

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that the Joint Assembly had considered this report at its meeting on 7 July 2016 where it received overwhelming support.

The Executive Board:

- (a) **APPROVED** the following three work packages:
 - (i) Researching 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.

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

The Executive Board considered a report which set out progress of the City Deal Skills Service to date and its achievement against key performance indicators.

Neil Darwin, Chief Executive of the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership, presented the report and highlighted that the aim of the Skills Service was to help to achieve the City Deal objectives of promoting an additional 420 apprenticeships over the first five years of the Deal in areas aligned with the City Deal's growth sectors and generally support the employability of young people. Mr Darwin highlighted that significant changes, introduced by the Government, would shortly be made to apprenticeships and would essentially see apprenticeship schemes become employer led rather than led by the provider community. The devolution proposal for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough also had the potential to introduce further changes, together with an Area Review that had recently been undertaken involving further education and how colleges worked. These factors therefore had fundamental impacts on how providers would work and operate in the future in respect of delivering and supporting apprenticeships in the Greater Cambridge area.

Mr Darwin emphasised that more engagement would be required with businesses in order to promote the benefits of apprenticeships and help employers better understand where apprenticeships could fit into and benefit their businesses. He envisaged working with the Joint Assembly's Skills Working Group to consider how the City Deal could influence employers in this way.

It was noted that the Skills Service contract commenced on 1 September 2015 and was approaching the end of the first year of delivery, which focussed 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 school;
- engaging employers and connecting them to schools and apprenticeship providers;
- supporting the development of strategic relationships between schools and employers.

Mr Darwin reported that Form the Future was reporting good progress against the key performance indicators in the contract for the Skills Service, meeting all targets and in some cases meeting them comfortably. The report included a table for frameworks or sector subjects included in the 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 academic years, with the 2013/2014 data being used as a baseline on the basis of this reflecting a full academic year prior to the establishment of the City Deal Partnership.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that the Joint Assembly had considered this report at its meeting on 7 July 2016. He reported that the recommendations contained within the report received unanimous support, but that the Assembly saw the target of 420 apprenticeships as a minimum and expected many more to be achieved. A concern was raised at the meeting in respect of dropout rates and it was noted that there was currently a 71% completion rate of apprenticeship schemes in

the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough area. It was noted that Members of the Assembly also agreed that more communication was required in terms of promoting more widely this strand of the City Deal and better explaining what it sought to achieve.

Councillor Hickford explained that the Joint Assembly, in addition to the recommendations set out in the report, had proposed a further recommendation to continue the work of the Joint Assembly Skills Working Group.

Councillor Tim Bick, Member of the Joint Assembly, expanded on the valuable work the Skills Working Group had carried out to date. He reported 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, adding that it had been challenging to define the baseline. The Group also significantly considered stem subjects and whether they should be counted by the area the apprentice lived, where the training provider was based or the location of the employer. It was noted that a decision was made to count apprenticeships based on 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, stating 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 reiterated Mr Darwin's comments, saying that the skills agenda was further complicated by the imminent Area Based Review, the result of the EU Referendum and devolution proposals for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, with uncertainty about investment in the area and a potential skills shortage in the future being key issues. He supported 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 saw the Working Group as having an important role to undertake in supporting delivery of the City Deal objective in this respect.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, welcomed the recommendation from the Joint Assembly in respect of the Skills Working Group, acknowledging its important role to date.

Councillor Francis Burkitt queried the definition of the target of 420 apprenticeships, referring to a South Cambridgeshire District Council Cabinet report in 2014 stating that it related to 16 to 23 year olds in contrast to the report at this meeting stating that the target was not age specific. He was concerned about this discrepancy and felt that the Skills Service should be measuring what was originally intended to be measured. Mr Darwin informed the Executive Board that he would confirm this point with the Skills Funding Agency.

In addition, Councillor Burkitt requested further information on the levels of apprenticeship associated with the target, which he understood to be non-graduate levels at 2 and 3. He felt that this breakdown was missing from the report. Mr Darwin agreed to include clarity around the levels of apprenticeship schemes in future progress reports.

Councillor Burkitt reflected on the decision that had been taken to count apprenticeships based on where the employer was based rather than where the person lived or where the provider was located. He made the point that if someone who lived outside of the Greater Cambridge area accessed an apprenticeship scheme at an employer located in the area, this was essentially providing an opportunity for someone outside of the remit of the City Deal and therefore questioned why that should be counted towards the target. Councillor

Bick, as a Member of the Working Group that determined this issue, responded by saying that the main objective behind the City Deal was to improve the local economy. It was in this context that it had been determined to count apprenticeships based on the location of the employer.

Councillor Burkitt referred to the apprenticeship framework list, which included 203 frameworks. He highlighted that the column on the list entitled sector subjects was much more useful and noted that 16 sector subjects were included, making the point that subjects such as life sciences had been omitted. Mr Darwin agreed that the framework list needed reviewing, confirming that this would be undertaken and a proposal brought back to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board for consideration in due course.

In terms of the target of 420 apprenticeships, Councillor Burkitt agreed with the Joint Assembly's aspiration of achieving more than that initial target and suggested the introduction of a stretch target, once confirmation had been received in respect of the age range of apprenticeships that would be counted towards the City Deal's target. Mr Darwin supported this suggestion.

Councillor Burkitt highlighted that the report scheduled for reporting back to the Board in November 2016 would include consideration towards the future funding position for the Skills Service. He questioned whether consideration to a results-based model would be included as part of this process. Mr Darwin confirmed that this would be looked into. Further work would also be undertaken around services to schools and a potential model for schools to purchase the specific support they needed.

Councillor Ian Bates sought greater involvement, engagement and connectivity with niche markets in the Greater Cambridge area and was supportive of the continuation of the Skills Working Group.

Councillor Herbert welcomed the partnership working that had occurred with this project and felt that it was right to review the areas that had been highlighted.

The Executive Board:

- (a) **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.
- (b) **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.

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

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, invited Councillor Bridget Smith to put forward a statement on this item.

Councillor Smith referred to a number of historical supporting documents and press releases relating to the City Deal commitment to provide 1,000 additional homes and noted that key words in each of the publications were 'commit', 'affordable' and 'for local people'. She felt that when local Members were asked to sell the City Deal to their residents, the big headline for those in South Cambridgeshire was that the Deal itself would deliver 1,000 additional, affordable homes on rural exception sites for local people.

She was therefore disappointed that the report was seeking the Board to renege on that deal so that the 1,000 additional homes were not delivered by the City Deal and that they would not be affordable, exclusively on rural exception sites or for local people.

Councillor Smith was of the opinion that the report manipulated the figures and the long accepted definition of rural exception sites, which she assumed was in order to tick off a target. She did not believe that the recommendations in the report, or the alternative suggestion put forward at the meeting of the Joint Assembly on 7 July 2016, would stand up to legal challenge, believing that this would cause irreparable damage to the reputation of the City Deal. Councillor Smith therefore called for the Executive Board to stick firmly to the vision and principles of the City Deal which were originally signed up to.

Councillor Herbert in response to the question said that this issue would be debated by Members of the Board as part of considering the item.

The Executive Board 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.

Stephen Kelly, Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development at Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, presented the report and explained that the City Deal commitment was to provide 1,000 additional units above the Local Plan allocation. In terms of a methodology, officers had identified a process for monitoring those additional homes which should be included. Mr Kelly referred Members to the appendices of the report which set out a list of eligible sites, 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 on this basis that 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.

Mr Kelly reflected on the meeting of the Joint Assembly held on 7 July 2016 where this issue was debated and a suggestion was made to include solely those affordable homes of 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 commitment. From a planning perspective he confirmed that either approach could be monitored for this purpose. Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reiterated that this alternative suggestion had been put forward at the meeting with five Members voting in favour, four Members voting against and four Member abstaining. He reported that there had been significant debate on this issue in terms of whether the original deal included a commitment to the additional homes being affordable and within rural exception sites, and whether what was proposed in the report represented the spirit of what was understood as being the original commitment.

Councillor Burkitt made the point that the word 'affordable' did not appear in the original City Deal agreement document, although a report to South Cambridgeshire District Council's Cabinet in 2014 did refer to affordable housing in the context of the 1,000 additional homes. He accepted the comprise suggested by the Joint Assembly and wanted the Board to progress beyond 1,000 additional homes, but accepted that Local Plans had not yet been adopted. He therefore proposed that the Board should consider the introduction of a stretch target after the Local Plans had been adopted. This was supported by the Board.

Alex Colyer, Executive Director (Corporate Services) at South Cambridgeshire District Council, reported 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 Councils that had suggested rural exception sites as being the only option available at that time given the stage in the Local Plan process and that it was a commitment derived from the Council's management teams to deliver more affordable housing as part of this. He emphasised that it was not the intention of officers through this report to dilute the issue of affordable housing in rural exception sites or manipulate any figures and that officers from the three partner Councils were committed to the delivery of affordable housing in rural exception sites. He made the point that housing in these sites in future would likely not be 100% affordable, but would be predominantly affordable, and that mechanisms were in place to respond to the Government's challenge. Mr Colyer was pleased to accept the challenge from Councillor Burkitt in respect of a new target and confirmed that a review mechanism for this purpose had been factored in at a very early stage of the process.

Mark Reeve accepted the statement from Councillor Bridget Smith and supported her sentiments, agreeing that it looked like the report had been written to manipulate the figures in order to meet the Government's target.

Councillor Ian Bates suggested that more time was required by the Board to give due consideration to this issue.

Councillor Herbert reflected on the discussion both at the meeting of the Joint Assembly and of Board Members at this meeting. He thought it was appropriate that changing circumstances should be recognised and noted that the original target in the City Deal agreement document was 1,000 additional homes, but stated that he and the Board wanted to go further than that and ensure that they were affordable homes.

The Executive Board therefore:

- (a) **RESTATED** its support to seek achievement of 1,000 additional affordable homes and asked officers to bring forward a report on this issue at its next meeting.
- (b) **AGREED** to consider the introduction of a stretch target after the Local Plans had been adopted.
- (c) **NOTED** progress towards delivery.

12. **GREATER CAMBRIDGE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AGENCY PROGRESS REPORT**

The Executive Board considered 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 and gave Members a presentation 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 took this opportunity to introduce the Executive Board to the following members of his team:

- Sabrina Walston – Assistant Managing Director;
- Gill Anderton – Housing Development Manager (South Cambridgeshire District Council);
- Nicola Hillier – Housing Development Manager (Cambridge City Council);
- Sarah Lyons – Housing Development Officer;
- Mark Wilson – Housing Development Officer;
- Amelia Norman – Trainee Housing Development Officer.

The presentation included a flowchart which illustrated the structure of the Housing Development Agency team.

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.

Mr Carter provided photographs of schemes that had been completed at Latimer Close and Stanesfield Road in Cambridge, Fen Drayton Road in Swavesey and Meldreth Road in Shepreth, some of which fell under the definition of affordable housing and were located within windfall sites in the city or rural exception sites in South Cambridgeshire. Members of the Board were impressed with the quality of the developments that had been completed and noted that the Virido development in the Cambridge Southern Fringe had commenced.

The Executive Board **NOTED** the report and presentation.

13. **OUTTURN REPORT FOR FINANCIAL YEAR ENDING 31 MARCH 2016**

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

The Executive Board:

- (a) **NOTED** the position of the Operational Budget and the Programme Budget for the 2015/16 financial year.
- (b) **APPROVED** 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.

14. **FINANCIAL MONITORING MAY 2016**

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

Councillor Francis Burkitt referred to paragraph 4.2.4 of the report and asked, in the context of the Smart Cambridge project team consisting of 0.7 fulltime equivalents, who and how many officers were supporting the transport aspect of the City Deal programme. It was noted that a written response to this query would be provided to Councillor Burkitt.

The Executive Board:

- (a) **NOTED** the financial position as at 31 May 2016.
- (b) **APPROVED** the increase in the budgetary provision for the current financial year as set out in section 4.2.4 of the report.

15. GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL DELEGATED POWERS SAFEGUARDS

The Executive Board 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.

The Executive Board:

- (a) **NOTED** that it agreed at its June meeting to adopt the consultation and engagement principles of the County Council.
- (b) **CONFIRMED** 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) **CONFIRMED** that all local elected Members from the three partner authorities, whose Divisions or Wards are within the geography of the scheme(s) in question, will be invited to be members of the Local Liaison Forums, as set out in the published terms of reference for Local Liaison Forums.
- (d) **CONFIRMED** that local elected Members and members of the public will be able to ask questions in respect of Traffic Regulation Orders at meetings of the Joint Assembly and Executive Board.
- (e) **AGREED** 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.

16. CITY DEAL PROGRESS REPORT

The Executive Board **NOTED** the progress report.

17. CITY DEAL FORWARD PLAN

The Executive Board **NOTED** the progress report.

The Meeting ended at 5.22 p.m.

This page is left blank intentionally.