



**GREATER
CAMBRIDGE
CITY DEAL**

Securing future prosperity

GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL EXECUTIVE BOARD

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board held on
Thursday, 10 November 2016 at 4.00 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 Kevin Price	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Roger Hickford	Cambridgeshire County Council and Chairman of the Joint Assembly
Councillor Bridget Smith	South Cambridgeshire District Council

Officers/advisors:

Mike Davies	Cambridgeshire County Council
Bob Menzies	Cambridgeshire County Council
Chris Malyon	Cambridgeshire County Council
Aaron Blowers	City Deal Partnership
Beth Durham	City Deal Partnership
Joanna Harrall	City Deal Partnership
Tanya Sheridan	City Deal Partnership
Neil Darwin	Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership
Stella Cockerill	Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership
Graham Watts	South Cambridgeshire District Council

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received.

The Executive Board **APPROVED** the co-option of Mark Reeve as a Member of the Board. Mr Reeve have been acting as a substitute at previous meetings and had now been formally nominated as the Local Enterprise Partnership's representative on the Board. The Local Enterprise Partnership would consider the nomination of its substitute or alternate representative in due course.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 13 October 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record, subject to the following amendments:

- the replacement of the second paragraph at minute number 4 in relation to a question by Carolyn Postgate where Councillor Francis Burkitt referred to University and College landholdings with the following:

‘Councillor Burkitt responded to the suspicion that the University might be seeking large scale greenbelt development by the back door by remarking that the landowners of the non-West Cambridge part of the West Fields were certain colleges rather than the University. Mr Coates correcting him, stating that the University was a minority landowner alongside the majority college owners. Councillor Burkitt accepted the correction.’

- the removal and addition of words to the paragraph at minute number 9 which commences ‘with regard to the suggested hybrid of options recommended by the Local Liaison Forum ...’, so that it reads as follows:

‘With regard to Scotland Farm, Councillor Burkitt made the point that this represented a site on the very limit of the greenbelt which he thought was worthy of consideration. He highlighted, however, that some thought would need to be given to whether that meant the busway should instead sit north of the A428.’

With regard to minute number 3 and Councillor Burkitt’s declaration of interest, he noted it had been suggested that he should have also declared the work that he and his employer undertook as a debt adviser to the University and certain colleges. In 2012 his employer advised the University on a £350 million bond issue and in 2013 it advised 17 colleges on a £150 million debt private placement, for which the firm received fees. These transactions were in the public domain and Councillor Burkitt was part of the team providing this advice. The firm had no retainer or on-going relationship or work with the University or colleges, or any expectation of future work. Councillor Burkitt had judged that, because the work was some years ago, in the past, closed and not on-going, it did not need disclosing at the meeting. He felt it prudent to place this on public record.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

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

Question by Hans Hagen

Hans Hagen said that Cambridge Biomedical Campus partners were concerned about the lack of progress in resolving the M11 Junction 11 bus lane issue, noting that the City Deal’s Forward Plan included an item on this issue. They were disappointed to see that this had slipped to consideration by the Joint Assembly on 1 December 2016 and subsequently the Executive Board on 8 December 2016.

He outlined that their understanding was that a separate bus-only slip road from the motorway to the Trumpington Park and Ride was no longer a favoured option, but that the junction could be improved to ensure the smooth flow of buses and cars from the

motorway to the Park and Ride. If this option were to be pursued, he understood that it would be considerably cheaper and faster to implement than the original slip road option.

Mr Hagen emphasised that the need for an improved junction was time critical, making the point that Papworth Hospital would start commuting to the Biomedical Campus from April 2018 and that partners planned to run a bus service to cater for them and other users of the site from the end of 2017. The take-up of that bus service would depend on it being reliable and fast. He said that without improvements to Junction 11 there was a significant risk that the increased traffic from April 2018 would result in long tailbacks from the Junction onto the M11.

He therefore asked the Executive Board whether it could take steps to ensure that there was no further slippage of consideration and resolution of this issue and that it was taken forward as a standalone tranche 1 project, rather than as a subset of the Western Orbital project.

Bob Menzies, Director of Strategy and Development at Cambridgeshire County Council, confirmed that the report scheduled for consideration by the Joint Assembly and Executive Board on the M11 and the Western Orbital would include timescales for taking the respective schemes forward, together with the outcome of discussions that had occurred with Highways England.

Councillor Francis Burkitt was very keen to address this particular junction in view of the reasons set out in the question. He himself had met with landowners and spoken to officers and highlighted that South Cambridgeshire District Council had also passed a motion in support of this project.

Councillor Burkitt expressed his frustration, however, that he had been continuously saying that the Board needed evidence to justify the proposals and said that, so far, there had been a significant lack of evidence provided. Regarding the Biomedical Campus partners' proposal to run a bus service for employees, he called for factual information outlining how many buses they envisaged running, how many people would potentially use them and the locations where employees were travelling from as this would assist the content of the report and create a stronger argument for supporting the business case associated with the project.

Mr Hagen responded by saying that some evidence had been presented to the Joint Assembly last year, setting out maps and the locations of where employees were travelling from.

Councillor Burkitt requested that as much information be forwarded to the officers as possible so that it could be reflected in the report scheduled for consideration at the December cycle of meetings of the Joint Assembly and Executive Board.

Question by Penny Heath

Penny Heath asked the Board to reconfirm the planning status of City Deal transport schemes and which City or County Council committees would do the scrutinising at planning level.

It was noted that transport infrastructure schemes involving development of the highway would fall under the jurisdiction of the Joint Development Control Committee, the membership of which comprised Cambridgeshire County Council, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council. Those schemes outside of the highway, such as the Chisholm Trail for example, would be determined by the Planning Committee of the

relevant planning authority. Larger and more significant schemes may need to have Transport Works Orders or Development Control Orders granted in order for them to proceed.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, agreed that a written response on this issue would be sent to Penny Heath for further clarity.

Regarding the Environmental Design Guide, Penny Heath asked what the working status of the document was, where the latest draft could be viewed, and who was coordinating the revised brief. She also referred to a letter by the Cambridge Architects' Association dated 16 September 2016 and asked whether the Board believed any of their recommendations could help improve the Design Guide.

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, highlighted that the Design Guide's status was that of a guidance document and not policy in the same context as statutory planning policy. The City Deal was obliged to follow the local planning framework and policies of the relevant Councils depending where the scheme was taking place. The aim of the Design Guide, as guidance, was to ensure that good practice could be captured and followed as part of City Deal schemes, in line with local policy.

It was noted that the revised version of the document was in the process of being developed and would be submitted to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board for consideration early in 2017.

Councillor Herbert highlighted that the Design Guide was currently being used in the development of the Histon Road and Milton Road transport infrastructure schemes.

Penny Heath queried whether any resources were available, reflecting on the significant input that could be added to the document from professionals such as architects and engineers, to bring people together in an attempt to significantly improve the document. Councillor Herbert agreed to consider holding a workshop early in 2017.

Question by Edward Leigh

Edward Leigh was unable to attend the meeting, but had submitted questions in respect of the scheme concept options lists for the Cambourne to Cambridge, Milton Road and Histon Road projects, as well as a range of questions in respect of the A428 Cambourne to Cambridge better bus journeys scheme.

Councillor Herbert noted the content of the questions and confirmed that a written response would be provided to Mr Leigh.

Question by Nicki Marrian

Nicki Marrian referred to the eight point plan as published on the City Deal website which sought to address congestion in the city, with one of those eight promises being on-street parking controls. She understood that responsibility for this issue had been delegated to the Cambridge Joint Area Committee and highlighted that the Committee had not consulted with Residents' Associations in the four months between July and October, as indicated at the Committee's July meeting. She therefore thought it was unlikely that the Committee would manage this between now and January.

Nicki Marrian therefore asked what the Executive Board was doing to ensure that work such as this, and a thorough assessment of the Hills Road cycleway, were given the urgent priority they deserved.

Councillor Herbert said that parking controls would be a key aspect of the congestion plan for Cambridge and that he and partners were committed to seeking the valuable input of Residents' Associations as part of decision-making, adding that it would be essential to get the details of these controls right. He made the point, however, that the City Deal Executive Board had no direct involvement in this aspect of the proposal. He was keen to see this progress and was committed to ensure that this was brought forward for consideration by the Committee early in the New Year.

It was noted that any final scheme would need to be approved by the relevant County Council committee and would involve public consultation.

Councillor Herbert made the point that although the City Deal Executive Board could not take any decision on an on-street parking control scheme, it saw this as an essential element of the wider access and congestion scheme. In view of this he said that the Board would be prepared to put resources in place for set up costs, meaning that residents themselves would not have to pay the initial upfront costs of a permit, for example. Councillor Herbert informed Nicki Marrian that he would personally make contact with the Joint Area Committee to establish its timescales.

Councillor Ian Bates was of the opinion that progress was being made through engagement with County and District Councillors, who were keen to ensure that they got this very important aspect of the wider congestion and access project right.

In terms of the Hills Road cycleway, Councillor Bates confirmed that an elected Member working group had been set up to review all cycling projects and schemes across the county.

Councillor Francis Burkitt reiterated that this was not something that the Executive Board had any control over and was personally equally as frustrated that it had taken so long to go through the Joint Area Committee. He urged Nicki Marrian to continue challenging the project's progress via the County and City Councils.

Councillor Herbert agreed to write an open letter in order that the Executive Board's views on this issue were in the public domain, to set out what financial support the Board would be willing to provide and establish the Joint Committee's timescale for consideration of the project.

Question by Dr Gabriel Fox

Dr Gabriel Fox asked whether the Executive Board would agree to instruct transport officers to conduct a full, fair and transparent appraisal of two modified versions of the option 1 bus route for the A428 Cambourne to Cambridge better bus journeys scheme, denoted as option 1a and option 1b as follows:

- options 1a and 1b were both express, high-quality bus services, with a similar number of stops to options 3 and 3a;
- these ran primarily along existing roads west of Madingley Mulch with signalisation of the roundabout to provide bus priority including an on-road and inbound bus lane from the A1303/A428 junction along Madingley Rise, and over the M11 overbridge, to the junction of Ada Lovelace Road, continuing through the West Cambridge site as envisaged with options 3 to 5;
- they would be supplemented by a Park and Ride at Scotland Farm and a high-quality, segregated cycleway and pedestrian walkway from Bourn to Cambridge via Coton;

- option 1a would run on the existing A428 dual carriageway as far as Madingley Mulch, with the future option of a high-occupancy vehicle lane in the event of future significant congestion developing on that road, continuing as above;
- option 1b would run on a new offline segregated dedicated bus route connection between Cambourne and Bourn Airfield, continuing along St Neots Road with bus priority measures in place to the A1303 and A428 junction, as above.

Dr Fox explained that these two options represented important differences from the option 1 route appraised and modelled to date, namely in their full online segregation inbound from Madingley Mulch to the West Cambridge site, together with service to that site. He felt that these features markedly improved performance compared to the original option 1 and provided a much fairer and more useful comparison to the fully segregated offline option 3 route. Dr Fox also suggested that there was initial evidence that the overall scoring for these options would be significantly higher than that for options 3 and 3a, with equivalent economic benefits.

Dr Fox also highlighted that these schemes did not require the completion of the planned feasibility work relating to two bus lanes on Madingley Rise, since this was already acknowledged in assessments commissioned by City Deal partners via Atkins that a single inbound bus lane, including over the M11 bridge, was technically feasible.

Councillor Herbert highlighted that significant consideration of the options relating to this scheme had taken place at the previous meeting of the Executive Board, where the Board took into account recommendations put forward by the Joint Assembly and Local Liaison Forum and had agreed to undertake further assessment of the feasibility of on-road options relating to Madingley Rise. A topographical survey had been commissioned in this respect and he explained that the next stage of the process would be to compare outline business cases against the practicalities of off-road options and the further analysis of the on-road options.

Mr Menzies explained that in taking the business cases further they had to be tested against a 'do minimum' option. Officers would therefore still be bringing forward work on option 1, as well as concentrating on segregation and the outcomes of the topographical survey.

Dr Fox did not feel that all options had gone through the same assessment process before being withdrawn for further consideration. He felt that the preferred options could not be considered as having been properly tested if they had not been tested against other reasonable options.

Councillor Burkitt asked for further clarity regarding the topographical survey. Mr Menzies confirmed that Skanska had been commissioned to carry out the survey and work had commenced onsite. The initial results of which would be shared with the Local Liaison Forum early in the New Year with preliminary engineering designs likely to be available in February 2017. He committed to provide this information on the City Deal website but, in view of the complexity and technical nature of the survey, advised that specific software may need to be used to enable people to view it.

Councillor Burkitt also asked for the Atkins report to be placed in the public domain. He was conscious that this was often referred to, so felt that for completeness it should be accessible via the City Deal website. Mr Menzies confirmed that the Atkins report had been used in assessing the different options at the outset of the scheme's development. It had been produced in June 2015 and Mr Menzies said it had been shared at that time with the Local Liaison Forum. He agreed to place this document for viewing on the City Deal website. Dr Fox disagreed that the document had been shared with the Local Liaison

Forum in June 2015.

In order to reach a conclusion regarding the assessment of options and the definition of 'do minimum' in respect of the analysis of preferred options, Councillor Herbert agreed to facilitate a meeting between Dr Fox and officers.

Question by Councillor Susan Van de Ven

Cambridgeshire County Councillor Susan Van de Ven said that funding would be required in order to complete the overall A10 cycle scheme in respect of the Melbourn to Royston segment. She said that this was a key micro-economic zone with a cluster of very significant employment centres with strong localised travel to work flows. She was encouraged that the Greater Cambridgeshire Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership was working on funding opportunities, but emphasised that this needed the Executive Board's continuing support, including being open to part funding on the Cambridgeshire side.

Councillor Herbert, on behalf of the Board, said that it was keen to make this scheme happen. He reminded those present that more clarity on the Growth Deal round 3 bid submitted by the Local Enterprise Partnership should be made available before the end of the year, together with the devolution proposals for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. He said that the Executive Board was trying to fill any funding gaps that may occur.

Councillor Van de Ven said that Foxton level crossing was becoming an ever increasing obstruction to mass transit along the A10 corridor, including the new cycleway, adding that Network Rail had shelved its feasibility study to close the crossing and build a bypass with a bridge or underpass. Addressing Foxton level crossing was on the City Deal's list of key components for unlocking sustainable transport potential along the A10 corridor, so Councillor Van de Ven asked the Board whether it could explore new funding arrangements including taking on the road aspects of what was a road and rail project.

Councillor Bates highlighted that Network Rail had identified this as a major scheme, likely to include a large underpass and significant bridge. The project had initially been included in Network Rail's programme and at the time of considering the City Deal's prioritised schemes for the tranche 1 programme it had been included as part of that programme, but with no City Deal funding allocated to it on the understanding that this scheme would be fully funded by Network Rail. Councillor Bates said that pressure needed to be put on Network Rail to ensure that this project was put back into its programme of schemes, noting that Heidi Allen, Member of Parliament for South Cambridgeshire, was keen to see this happen as well.

Councillor Herbert agreed to write to Heidi Allen MP on behalf of the Executive Board to seek her support in raising this issue with the Minister and provide an update back to the Board on the status of any such discussions.

Mark Reeve made the point that private sector leverage would be an important aspect of funding for projects such as this, so a strong business case needed to be brought forward. He highlighted that the Local Enterprise Partnership was working with Members of Parliament and partners regarding a similar situation as part of the Ely North scheme.

Councillor Herbert acknowledged that there was no pressing business case for this scheme so it was likely to be considered as part of the City Deal's tranche two programme.

Councillor Van de Ven reported that Meldreth, Shepreth and Foxton stations were experiencing a 10% increase in footfall every year and in 2018 train capacity was expected to quadruple with the advent of a half-hourly off-peak service and eight-car trains. However, she noted that there were no plans to upgrade these stations as transport interchanges to meet modern demand. She informed the Board that last spring the Meldreth, Shepreth and Foxton Community Rail Partnership had commissioned Railfuture to carry out an audit of all three stations. This had now been published and provided a comprehensive overview of necessary work to modernise the stations. She felt that a next step that could unlock funding from other sources for station infrastructure improvement would be station travel planning. Councillor Van de Ven therefore asked the Executive Board if it would consider supporting this.

Councillor Herbert agreed to consider inclusion of these railway sites as part of consideration of schemes for inclusion in the City Deal's tranche 2 programme.

Councillor Burkitt asked for clarity over how much of an investment was necessary. It was noted that this had been estimated at £10,000. Councillor Burkitt felt that the City Deal should be able to provide all or part of the investment required and the Chairman agreed to follow this up.

Councillor Burkitt reminded the Board that he had contacted all Parish Councils in South Cambridgeshire, in his capacity as a Cabinet Member at the District Council, to seek their ideas for transport hubs.

Question by Jim Chisholm

Jim Chisholm was very pleased to see that the Chisholm Trail project had reached this critical stage and took the opportunity to thank all officers, elected Members and other interested parties for their support and hard work in ensuring the scheme reached this point. He added that it was good to see a City Deal project that had almost universal support and that he felt could bring wide and sustainable benefits to people in Cambridge and its environs.

He highlighted that two of the largest non-political membership organisations in the area, the Cambridge Cycling Campaign and Cambridge Past Present and Future, had supported the principle of this route over many years. Mr Chisholm asked that officers, elected Members and other parties continued to work together to ensure that the Chisholm Trail reached completion. He also asked that the City, County and South Cambridge Councils worked effectively with business and education partners to ensure that both the River Bridge and phase 1 could be completed as soon as possible, and that the Greater Cambridge City Deal partnership worked equally hard towards the next phase.

Councillor Herbert thanked Mr Chisholm for his support and said that the Board was determined to see this project through and that discussions with all interested parties would continue as part of its development.

5. PETITIONS

The Executive Board **NOTED** two petitions received in relation to city centre access and congestion and **DEFERRED** consideration of these petitions to the meeting of the Board scheduled to be held on 25 January 2017, to coincide with a report on city centre access and congestion scheduled for submission to that meeting.

6. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE JOINT ASSEMBLY

The Joint Assembly had met on 3 November 2016 and it was agreed that the Chairman of the Assembly would present any recommendations or comments from that meeting at the relevant item.

7. CITY DEAL FORWARD PLAN

The Executive Board considered the latest version of the City Deal Forward Plan, noting those changes made since the last meeting.

Councillor Francis Burkitt queried the item on the City Deal's tranche 2 programme scheduled for consideration at the next cycle of meetings and asked what this would entail. Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, explained that the item would set out a proposed timescale and methodology for considering the prioritisation of schemes for inclusion in that programme. She also made reference to the devolution proposals and made the point that if the seven local authorities in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough agreed to a deal it may be necessary to consider how that investment aligned with the City Deal.

Tanya Sheridan also highlighted that, as part of the tranche 1 programme, the Board had made a decision to develop tranche 2 schemes early in order that they were ready for development and could be delivered as soon as that further funding became available.

In terms of initial timescales, it was anticipated that analysis of scheme prioritisation subsequent to tranche 2 being considered at the next cycle of meetings would be brought back to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board for approval in the autumn 2017. Councillor Burkitt requested a more comprehensive Forward Plan for future Board meetings in order that items such as this scheduled for consideration in the autumn of 2017 were clearly set out. He cited examples such as the Smart Cambridge project, the Greenways project and the transport schemes at Histon Road and Milton Road where he felt it should be clearer in the Forward Plan when updates or reports on these issues were due to be reported back to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board.

Councillor Burkitt suggested including an item on on-street parking, further to a question by Nicki Marrian earlier at this meeting, by way of an update of progress. It was suggested that this could be included as part of the City Deal progress report in March 2017, but Councillor Burkitt was of the view that this should be an item in its own right.

With regards to Histon Road and Milton Road, it was noted that the Local Liaison Forums associated with these transport schemes had met on 8 November 2016 and would be meeting again two or three times before early December. Officers confirmed that they were aiming to bring a report on these schemes to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board at the January 2017 cycle of meetings.

The Executive Board **NOTED** the City Deal Forward Plan.

8. CITY DEAL PROGRESS REPORT

The Executive Board considered the City Deal progress report, together with a separate report in relation to the Smart Cambridge programme.

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, presented the update and reported that construction of the extended A10 cycle scheme had recently commenced.

Councillor Francis Burkitt referred to the update on payment by results and asked when information would be shared regarding the awarding of the contract. It was noted that it should be possible to communicate this to Board Members next week.

The Executive Board **NOTED** the City Deal progress report and separate report in respect of the Smart Cambridge programme.

9. THE CHISHOLM TRAIL

The Executive Board considered a report which provided an update on the Chisholm Trail cycling scheme.

Mike Davies, Team Leader (Cycling Projects) at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report and reminded the Board of the following principles of the route:

- it was a direct and pleasant route with improved journey ambience;
- it linked to key destinations and trip generators;
- it was inclusive, supporting people with disabilities;
- it was safe and avoided traffic;
- it provided seamless links to green spaces;
- it supported multi-modality.

Mr Davies added that the key principle behind this scheme, and the City Deal programme as a whole, was to make active modes safe, convenient and the logical choice over private car, highlighting the wider benefits as being improved public health, assisting to address congestion, better air quality and more reliable journeys.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that unanimous support was given to the recommendations contained within the report upon consideration by the Assembly at its meeting on 3 November 2016. He outlined, however, concerns expressed by Assembly Members in relation to phase 2 of the scheme regarding negotiations with Network Rail over the proposed purchase of land. These negotiations had taken some time to date and it was unclear when a final decision would be made by Network Rail as to whether or not the land would be available for the phase 2 scheme. An alternative approach had been suggested by officers, as outlined in the report, which featured a bridge. The Assembly was informed that the proposed bridge would begin and end in new housing developments, but Councillor Hickford questioned how this new bridge could be delivered alongside and be linked into these new housing developments given the respective timescales. He emphasised the importance of knowing as soon as possible whether Network Rail would be willing to sell the land in order that officers, the Joint Assembly and the Executive Board could understand whether or not investigating other alternatives was necessary.

Councillor Francis Burkitt highlighted that, as with the A10 cycleway scheme and Foxton rail crossing discussed earlier at this meeting, Network Rail were again a factor in the scheme's development. He questioned whether the Member of Parliament for Cambridge may be able to offer some assistance.

Mr Davies confirmed that discussions were still ongoing but highlighted that he, together with other officers from the County Council, would be meeting on-site in Cambridge with senior representatives of Network Rail in three weeks time. He agreed to seek to progress these discussions as part of that meeting, but said that the added support of Members of Parliament and the Executive Board would be welcomed should this prove unsuccessful.

Mr Davies confirmed that the bridge was essentially an alternative option to the original proposal, something that he felt was right to start planning for given the uncertainty around the availability of Network Rail's land for phase 2 of the scheme. The specific location of the bridge on the plan set out in the report was deliberately vague in order that this did not cause any alarm to people living in the area and due to its conceptual nature at this stage.

Councillor Herbert requested that an update on negotiations with Network Rail be reported to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board as part of the next cycle of meetings. He acknowledged that there were challenges to overcome with regard to phase 2 of the scheme and understood that Network Rail itself was looking ahead at its own programme. Councillor Herbert was pleased with the progress made to date with the scheme as a whole, stating that the Chisholm Trail would provide strong links to employment sites, large residential areas and travel hubs and that the Executive Board would demonstrate its determination in continuing to complete it.

The Executive Board:

- (a) **NOTED** the scheme progress being made in terms of planning approval, land procurement and stakeholder engagement.
- (b) **APPROVED** construction of phase one of the scheme, subject to gaining planning permission.
- (c) **DELEGATED** powers to approve the construction contract and selection of contractor for phase one.
- (d) **SUPPORTED** the continuation of land negotiations.

10. BUILDING A LOCALLY RESPONSIVE SKILLS SYSTEM - PROGRESS UPDATE

The Executive Board considered a report which reviewed the progress made from September 2015 to August 2016 against the skills related commitments articulated in the City Deal agreement.

Stella Cockerill, Skills Lead from the City Deal Partnership, presented the report which focussed on the following three key areas:

- a review of the performance of the Local Skills Service, facilitated by Form the Future;
- a review of progress against the skills related commitments in the City Deal;
- a review about the way progress was measured in the future.

It was noted that the skills related commitments undertaken, which were general as opposed to being focussed on STEM based growth sectors alone, included the following:

- creation of a locally funded skills team to work with small and medium enterprises in the area to develop training plans and act as co-ordinators to ensure training aligned with employer need;
- establishment of a skills action plan for each of the priority sectors, including identifying the apprenticeship framework offer;
- creation of locally funded adult careers teams to enhance information advice and guidance in growth sectors based on strong labour market information;
- developing labour market intelligence to inform the provision of information, advice and guidance for young people, providers, parents and employers;

- working closely with the National Careers Service local offer.

Over five years, from 2014/15, it had been agreed that the City Deal would deliver:

- 420 additional apprenticeships to support growth sectors;
- 50 more employers engaging with schools and colleges;
- 25 more employers engaging with traineeships;
- 150 more employers raised awareness of apprenticeships.

The Skills Service had undertaken one full year of delivery and an evaluation of the first year of the skills programme was appended to the report. Stella Cockerill reported that the Service had demonstrated a good level of engagement with employers and schools, with indications to date showing that this was working and making a difference. She highlighted that the position nationally in relation to skills and apprenticeships had changed significantly since the City Deal agreement was first made. She made the point, in respect of growth areas, that recognition had to be given to the fact that businesses themselves would set out where they needed to grow, therefore meaning that some of the 420 additional apprenticeships would not necessarily fit into the STEM based growth sectors originally selected as priorities for the City Deal. She added, however, that on a more wider perspective all apprenticeships still supported local economic growth.

Councillor Tim Bick, Member of the Joint Assembly, provided an update on behalf of the Assembly's Skills Sub-Group which had operated as a sounding board in the preparation of this report and the recommendations contained within, which it supported. He said that the report brought forward a strategic view of what was trying to be achieved and provided a model for discussing the skills thread of the City Deal as it moved forward.

Councillor Bick reported that the City Deal had established a wider view of the Skills Service as a result of this workstream. This service helped young people to understand their career options and develop their employability through contact with employers. He emphasised, however, that this was only one aspect of the service, with the others being:

- demand from employers who understood the business case for investment in skills and how to go about accessing the rest of the system;
- provision of relevant training and vocational education programmes by providers who understood employer need and were responsive to it.

Councillor Bick said that these two issues presented the Skills Service with some particular challenges to overcome but that the recommendations contained within the report sought to address them.

Councillor Bick highlighted the long discussion that took place at the meeting of the Joint Assembly on 3 November 2016 in respect of how progress against its target of 420 additional apprenticeships should be measured. He understood the many comments expressed at that meeting but was of the opinion that the Board should give itself a realistic chance of success in this area as well as having a realistic view of growth. He said that those top priorities for the Board in terms of STEM based growth sectors would continue to be the drivers for the Service, but the Skills Sub-Group had recognised that including additional apprenticeships solely in these sectors would not enable the Board to achieve what was originally intended when the City Deal agreement was signed with regards to achieving 420 additional apprenticeships.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reiterated that significant debate had ensued on this item at the last meeting of the Assembly. He reflected on the

Assembly's membership, comprising a mix of elected Members together with representatives of the business sector and further education institutions, which he felt had greatly contributed to that debate and had provided effective challenge and consideration of the issue. He reported that the main point of discussion was around the table set out in the report at paragraph 31 which outlined the high, medium and low apprenticeship categories and that the Joint Assembly agreed with the recommendation to include all categories when measuring apprenticeships against the City Deal target.

Councillor Francis Burkitt was very supportive of this workstream, highlighting that the City Deal was not solely about transport schemes. He was pleased with the Service's performance over the last 12 months and said that it was delivering well against its key performance indicators. Performance to date had focussed more on education than with employers and in asking whether it was the intention to place more emphasis on employers it was noted that the proposed review of performance indicators sought to achieve this. This would include a much greater focus on the monitoring of outputs.

Councillor Burkitt sought clarity regarding the breakdown of additional apprenticeships achieved to date, together with an understanding of the baseline information that had been provided and which the 420 additional apprenticeships were being measured against.

It was noted that the academic year for 2013/14 had been used as a baseline. This consisted of 1078 apprenticeships in all frameworks and sectors, including traineeships and apprenticeships at Levels 2, 3 and 4 for those commencing solely in the Greater Cambridge area as identified by the delivery postcode of the provider or employer location. 214 of those apprenticeships for the 2013/14 academic year were in apprenticeship frameworks or standards aligned to the City Deal's identified growth sectors categorised as the following types of apprenticeships:

- science and mathematics;
- engineering and manufacturing technologies, not including transportation, operations and maintenance;
- construction, planning and the built environment;
- information and communication technologies, not including for users.

In terms of progress made there were 1097 apprenticeship starts across all sectors in the 2014/15 academic year, which was an increase of 19 from 2013/14. 275 of the 1097 starts were in apprenticeship frameworks or standards related to the City Deal's growth sectors.

For the 2015/16 academic year, non-validated information indicated that this had increased to 1100 apprenticeships in total across all sectors, an increase of 3 from the previous year, and 328 of the 1100 starts were in apprenticeship frameworks or standards in the City Deal's growth sectors.

In taking the baseline of 1078 apprenticeships across all sectors, the target for 2018/19 for all additional apprenticeships was 1498. The Skills Service was aiming for an additional 365 apprenticeships over the next two years across all sectors and it was anticipated that, if the current trends continued, most of this would come from the growth sectors.

Based on the current trajectory, it was noted that the target of 420 additional apprenticeships based on all sectors across the length of the tranche 1 programme was in itself a challenging target to meet. Councillor Burkitt questioned the intention and interpretation of the original City Deal agreement to achieve 420 additional apprenticeships solely in growth areas. Based on the information presented, he accepted

that this was a target which could never be realistically met and therefore agreed that additional apprenticeships in all sectors should be counted.

Councillor Burkitt asked where the information derived from and how often this could be presented to the Executive Board. Stella Cockerill explained that the Local Enterprise Partnership had access to the data which could be presented five times a year although it was noted that some of this may not be validated until the completion of a full academic year. It was agreed that updates could be provided the Board on a quarterly basis.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, put on record his thanks to the Skills Service which he said had taken this aspect of the skills workstream to a far better level and was effectively linking up the key strands. He added that this work had demonstrated leadership from the Local Enterprise Partnership and an impressive performance by Form the Future. He also took this opportunity to thank the Joint Assembly's Skills Sub-group for its contributions.

The Executive Board **AGREED** to:

- (a) Extend Form the Future's contract for a further 12 months, from September 2017 to August 2018.
- (b) Set aside £160,000 for the academic year 2017/18 and assume a continuation of funding for a brokerage service in 2018/19 at approximately the same funding level.
- (c) Review the focus and targets for the period 2017/18 and begin contract negotiations along these lines;
- (d) Set aside £35,000 for the period January to December 2017 and assume a continuation of this into 2018 to develop Career Champions in schools.
- (e) Endorse the approach to progressing with the development of Labour Market Information to inform the Information Advice and Guidance for young people, adults, providers, parents and employers and support the work of the Local Skills Service and National Careers Service.
- (f) Begin negotiations with Cambridge Regional College to develop an outcome based activity plan that would support businesses to understand the changes in relation to apprenticeships and the levy and carry out Training Needs Analysis to help businesses to identify their skills needs.
- (g) Endorse a revised approach to how progress was measured towards the 420 apprenticeship starts and gain agreement from the Skills Funding Agency and the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy to this approach.
- (h) Endorse this approach to recording and monitoring the additional skills related to outcomes in the City Deal.

11. GREATER CAMBRIDGE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AGENCY - SIX MONTH UPDATE

The Executive Board considered a report which provided an update on the work of the Housing Development Agency.

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, presented the report and highlighted the following activities that had occurred during April to September 2016:

- establishment of governance arrangements;
- approval of the 2016/17 business plan;
- recruitment to the staff team;
- commencement with delivery of the committed programme of schemes;
- working to secure housing grant under the proposed devolution agreement;
- securing approval for and working to set up an investment partnership for Cambridge City Council.

Tanya Sheridan reported that 63 houses had been built as part of the programme so far, with four other sites where building work had commenced on new housing, which included affordable housing.

An updated appendix had been circulated which corrected the figures relating to Gamlingay confirming that, of the 14 dwellings, 10 dwellings were market homes and 4 dwellings were affordable homes.

Councillor Francis Burkitt was disappointed that a graph had not been included within the report to illustrate how delivery compared to the City Deal's target of 1,000 additional homes. He felt that this would be the best way to demonstrate progress against the target and reiterated his request for this to be included as part of future update reports.

Councillor Burkitt queried reference in the report to the County Council withdrawing some of its schemes from the Housing Development Agency. Councillor Ian Bates provided reassurance that the County Council was still supporting the Housing Development Agency, with three schemes in the current programme as set out in the report. It had withdrawn four of its schemes, with one also having been withdrawn early in 2016.

Chris Malyon, Cambridgeshire County Council's Chief Finance Officer, explained that the County Council had its own housing development company and it was therefore a decision for the company as to how it procured its schemes. He emphasised that the Council's housing development company was different to the City Deal's Housing Development Agency in that the company would be able to acquire land and build houses and that it would cover the whole of the county rather than specifically the Greater Cambridge area, whereas the Agency was effectively a project management company.

Mark Reeve shared Councillor Burkitt's concerns regarding the County Council withdrawing schemes from the programme as it appeared to him that the authority was no longer prepared to use the City Deal's Housing Development Agency. He felt that the two entities were doing the same thing and that there was a conflict. Mr Reeve made reference to the proposed devolution deal and the further monies it would make available to support housing in particular, stating that a joined up approach was necessary.

Councillor Herbert agreed that alignment was a key issue, but made the point that geography would also be a key consideration.

Mr Malyon reiterated that the County Council's housing development company was different to the City Deal's Housing Development Agency for the reasons cited above. It would be able to utilise the Housing Development Agency for delivery of some schemes, but ultimately this would be a decision of the company's Board.

Councillor Kevin Price, Cambridge City Councillor and Member of the Joint Assembly, made the point that all three partner Councils had housing development companies which were all doing different things, adding that each respective company may decide to use the Housing Development Agency now or at some stage in the future.

The Executive Board **NOTED** the report.

12. CITY DEAL FINANCIAL STRATEGY - 2016/2020

The Executive Board considered a report which set out a proposed Financial Strategy for the City Deal partnership.

Chris Malyon, Chief Financial Officer at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report and highlighted the following proposals that would form the foundation to the City Deal partnership's Financial Strategy:

- the City Deal partnership would continue with operational and programme proposals;
- the operational budget would be funded through New Homes Bonus and interest in balances;
- the programme would be funded through the City Deal Grant, Section 106 Agreement funding and any other funding sources directly attributable to projects within the programme;
- use of New Homes Bonus to fund transport infrastructure investments within the programme would need specific approval of the Executive Board;
- the cost of providing support services, such as finance, democratic services and legal costs, would be resourced from the operational budget;
- the local councils would retain all New Homes Bonus funds until they were required;
- the accountable body would allocate interest on net cash balances to the operational budget;
- any proposal for new investment would be supported with a robust business case proportionate to the size of investment required and set out how the proposal achieved the agreed aims of the City Deal.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, was keen that the City Deal managed the transport related aspects of the City Deal's finances with other contributions such as Section 106 Agreement funding and other additional grant funding or external funding streams. He was also keen to ensure that the New Homes Bonus element was managed transparently in view of it having to be accounted back to each partner Council as providers of that aspect of the City Deal's budget.

Councillor Francis Burkitt highlighted a funding gap in the first tranche of the City Deal programme, consisting of approximately £20 million, but also referred to possible Section 106 Agreement contributions in the report of approximately £40 million for the first tranche of the scheme. He made the point that if this Section 106 Agreement contribution was not received, there would actually be a £60 million funding gap in the tranche 1 programme.

Mr Malyon explained that the projections for the Section 106 Agreement contributions had been calculated based on assumptions and understandings of when developments were expected to occur. He highlighted that there was a difference in funding of a programme compared to cash received and made the point that the report referred to the overall funding position. Mr Malyon added that the Board may need to consider taking a decision to borrow against receipts in the future before Section 106 Agreement funding was physically received, which he said was normal practice for the County Council when developing transport schemes for example.

Councillor Burkitt asked when the Board would need to take a final decision regarding which underfunded aspect of its tranche 1 programme would need to be removed should additional funding streams not be identified, principally around the £20 million shortfall that was currently identified. Mr Malyon explained that this would form part of the annual budget setting process but that it would ultimately be a decision for the Board as part of considering the City Deal's budget.

Mr Malyon highlighted that the future of New Homes Bonus funding was still unclear following the Government's consultation in March 2016 to which no outcomes had been published or shared at this stage. He said that there would be changes resulting from the consultation and he anticipated these having a huge impact on that aspect of the City Deal's funding.

Mark Reeve agreed that cash flow was a significant issue, particularly in respect of the large projects in the tranche 1 programme. He asked at what point cash flow would become a factor in the Board's thinking considering the reality that there was uncertainty regarding other contributions, New Homes Bonus and the local economy. He said that a plan needed to be established at an early stage to identify how borrowing would be acquired.

Councillor Herbert acknowledged the concerns that had been raised and was content with looking into the figures in more detail, but did not think they were fundamental concerns at this stage of the programme and expected the budget as set out in the report to change significantly as schemes developed. He highlighted the benefits of Section 106 Agreement and New Homes Bonus funding as being flexible, additional funds and agreed that risk-based borrowing would also be an option.

Mr Reeve acknowledged that the principle of borrowing had not necessarily been considered by the Board yet and said it was something that should be looked at, highlighting that there were opportunities for private finance that could be explored as part of that.

The Executive Board **APPROVED** the Financial Strategy of the City Deal Partnership.

13. CITY DEAL FINANCIAL MONITORING

The Executive Board considered a report which provided an update on the City Deal's financial monitoring position for the period ending 30 September 2016.

The Executive Board **NOTED** the financial position as at 30 September 2016.

Prior to closing the meeting, Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, reported that this would be Graham Watts' last meeting of the Board. Mr Watts had supported the governance and administration of the Board since its inception in 2014 and Members of the Board put on record their thanks to him.

The Meeting ended at 6.55 p.m.
