



## **GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL JOINT ASSEMBLY**

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly held on  
Wednesday, 16 September 2015 at 10.00 a.m.

PRESENT:

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

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

### **Officers/advisors:**

Andrew Limb	Cambridge City Council
Graham Hughes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Chris Malyon	Cambridgeshire County Council
Stuart Walmsley	Cambridgeshire County Council
Adrian Cannard	Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership
Graham Watts	South Cambridgeshire District Council

### **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Tim Wotherspoon (South Cambridgeshire District Council).

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

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 15 July 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

### **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were made.

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

Questions received and the answers provided were noted as follows:

**Question by Anthony Carpen**

"What assessment have Assembly Members made of the Board's communication strategy for the City Deal, with specific focus on social media and community outreach?"

"What views do Assembly Members have for improving how the people of Cambridge and its institutions communicate with each other?"

"Following my question on 28 January 2015 to the City Deal Executive Board regarding the Haverhill Rail Campaign, what assessment have Assembly Members made on the follow-up made by the Executive Board, and their own scrutiny of the plans and work the Rail Campaign has done?"

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, highlighted that the communications strategy had been adopted in November 2014 when the Executive Board was operating as a Shadow Board and prior to the establishment of the Joint Assembly. He also reported that an appointment was yet to be made for the City Deal Communications Manager post and it was his view that the Joint Assembly should consider the communications strategy once the Manager had been appointed. Councillor Bick was keen for this appointment to be made as soon as possible.

In terms of improving how the people of Cambridge and its institutions communicated, Councillor Bick said that this was an important issue but that the Joint Assembly's considerations had to be in the context of the City Deal.

Graham Hughes, Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, stated that nothing had changed in respect of Haverhill rail from what was reported in response to Mr Carpen's question at the Executive Board on 28 January 2015. He reported that work was underway on the A1307 corridor, although it was noted that this would not look into the railway issue in any detail, and emphasised that the cost of a railway scheme at Haverhill was much larger than the budget available as part of the Greater Cambridge City Deal.

**Question by Lynn Hiatt**

"Recently a number of innovative proposals to deal with traffic congestion have come to light in the press and in presentations by individuals. Some in my view are quite imaginative, dealing with the root of the problem by eliminating it through 'smart traffic management', as opposed to accommodating congestion as if it were inevitable.

For example, ideas such as electronic 'gates' just outside the city, giving buses priority and thus predictable, quick journey-times for commuters, achieve the stated aims of the City Deal Options 1A-C and eliminate the need for vastly expensive, disruptive and extremely unpopular new bus-roads down residential roads or through valued green spaces.

There are other ideas, including for a metro system; for 'road pricing' schemes (congestion-charging, employer parking-space tax etc.); for better cycle paths within and from the villages; for school transport via a fleet of buses at park and rides; for tourist-bus parking and the like. The initial elements of some of these plans could be delivered quickly and would be better value for money; intelligent use of smart technology would undoubtedly gain international attention and plaudits for the Council.

I am not in any way advocating one plan or the other, but believe that residents of Cambridge and surrounding villages should be allowed to consider very carefully all good ideas for dealing with a problem that is personal for them, every day.

Can residents expect at least some of these other proposals to deal with congestion to be added to the three currently on offer for City Deal money? If not, why not?"

Mr Hughes highlighted that the introduction of electronic gating, or queue relocation as it was otherwise known, posed very serious issues that would need to be assessed as this would essentially involve pushing queues to the outskirts of the City. He did not think that this was necessarily a solution to the problem, in the way it had been expressed as part of this specific question.

In terms of the question itself, Mr Hughes said that this would be a decision for the Executive Board to make in terms of how and what it wanted to consult on. The Board had made it clear that it wanted to start a debate with traffic generators in the City, such as employers, the university and retail businesses for example, prior to commencing with wider consultation.

Councillor Bick asked whether it was likely that the consultation would incorporate a mixture of solutions to alleviate congestion in the City. Mr Hughes was of the view that a mixture of solutions would provide a better outcome than a single solution in view of the complexity of the problems in and around Cambridge, but he could not say at this stage what they might look like or what they would involve.

#### **Question by Councillor Des O'Brien**

"Can the City Deal Assembly confirm what research has been completed to determine the increase in passenger numbers that will justify the cost of the Cambourne to Cambridge bus route scheme by significantly reducing private car usage? The latest figures on bus use at Cambourne come from the 2011 census and put the number of residents of Cambourne using the bus at 5%. That indeed is all bus journeys not just to Cambridge so one would can assume the percentage of the population making bus journeys to Cambridge to be lower still. What is the target percentage of resident from Cambourne, and potentially West Cambourne, that will make the route viable and the investment justifiable? How has that target been determined and what are the guarantees it will be achieved?"

Mr Hughes emphasised that the A428 proposals were at a very early stage and the consultation process had not yet commenced, but was due to start on 12 October 2015. This consultation would only set out options, in principle, with decisions on a favoured route and further development work scheduled to take place subsequent to that. He reminded Members that any transport scheme had to have a detailed business case in place that would be subject to approval by the Department of Transport. If the business case did not achieve this approval the scheme would not be given the funding to enable it to go ahead. The business case included a variety of issues for all users of the network and so would not solely focus on the number of passengers using public transport.

Mr Hughes also made the point that current usage of the bus network should not be a determining factor for proposed schemes. The current route along the A428 was not attractive to service users, with proposed transport schemes as part of the City Deal seeking to make bus routes in particular much more reliable and efficient in order that they attracted more people to use public transport rather than private motor vehicles. He added that there was evidence from schemes elsewhere in the county that increased patronage would be achieved as a result of improving bus route infrastructure. He gave the Busway and the A1307 corridor as examples of this.

## 5. PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

## 6. REPORTS SCHEDULED TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL EXECUTIVE BOARD

### 6 (a) M11 bus-only slip-roads feasibility report

The Joint Assembly considered a report which contained a high level appraisal of the technical implications and costs of creating bus-only slip-roads at the following locations:

- (i) M11 junction 13: when turning off the A1303 (going east) onto the M11 (going south);
- (ii) M11 junction 13: creating a bus lane alongside the existing slip-road off the M11, that would get priority treatment at the traffic lights;
- (iii) M11 junction 11: turning off the M11 (going south) between the existing farm and footbridge and the existing slip-road, then going round the corner of the farmland at Trumpington Meadows, running parallel to (and west of) Trumpington Road, and entering Trumpington Road Park and Ride thence joining up to the Guided Busway.

Stuart Walmsley, Head of Major Infrastructure Delivery at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report and stated that in relation to junction 13 it was considered necessary in order to ensure that the appraisal was realistic in an operational context, to assess options for bus priority across the junction. This was due to it being unrealistic to only appraise bus slip-roads if buses could not access the slip-roads with priority. Mr Walmsley, in presenting the report, took Members through the high-level concepts that had been developed for the areas set out in (i) to (iii) above, and referred to the feasibility report that had been produced as appended to the report.

Mr Walmsley emphasised the point that there were still a number of issues to consider within the Western orbital transport infrastructure scheme, which was a scheme within the tranche two priority programme although approval had been granted to commence initial works to develop options for the scheme.

Councillor Francis Burkitt, as the proposer of the original request for this report, put forward his thanks on behalf of the Joint Assembly to officers for undertaking this piece of work to a high standard and within tight timescales. He noted that these junctions would form part of the Western orbital route as well as impact the A428 corridor and was of the opinion that the concepts relating to junction 11 were very discreet and deliverable. In asking whether the Board should be recommended to progress a particular piece of work for junction 11, the following points were noted from the resulting discussion:

- the concepts within the feasibility report for junction 11 looked fairly simple and uncontentious;
- improvements to junction 11 would be quite key to employment sites and large employers, such as Astra Zeneca for example;
- junction 11 could potentially be added to the A428 transport infrastructure scheme.

Mr Walmsley reminded Members that improvements to junction 11 did not currently feature as a priority in the City Deal's transport infrastructure programme for tranche one, which already totalled £180 million when there was only £100 million of City Deal funding available. There were also risks of progressing works on the M11 ahead of the Western

orbital scheme scheduled to be delivered as part of tranche two of the City Deal, as it was unclear at this stage what that scheme would look like and how it would impact junctions 11 and 13 of the M11. In addition, Graham Hughes, Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, confirmed that adding improvements to junction 11 of the M11 onto the A428 transport infrastructure scheme could slow down progress of the scheme's delivery and require the amendment of its business case, which had already been worked up. He reminded Members that one of the schemes currently within the agreed priority programme for tranche one may need to be removed to make way for this project should a decision be made to proceed.

Discussion then ensued on disconnecting improvements on junction 11 from other City Deal transport schemes and progressing this as a separate project. It was noted that £800,000, the cost of one of the concepts, could potentially unlock this junction which it seemed was ready to be delivered. Another view put forward, however, was that undertaking works on junction 11 at this stage could limit options for the Western orbital scheme.

Mr Hughes agreed with the latter point and said that in the fullness of time the slip-roads could cease to be used or that they could even be removed altogether as part of the wider Western orbital scheme. He added that improving this junction would only deal with part of the problem and confirmed advice from officers as being not to proceed with this as an individual project but to build it into the Western orbital work.

A question was asked as to why there was such a large variance between estimated costings for some of the concepts. Mr Walmsley reported that a lot of risk was built into the estimated cost of schemes, as well as each being costed against known practices for similar schemes delivered elsewhere.

The Chairman, in conclusion, felt that there was a clear desire by some Members of the Joint Assembly to accelerate improvements to junction 11 of the M11. Voting on this proposal, with 7 votes in favour and 6 votes against, the Joint Assembly **AGREED** that the Executive Board be requested to accelerate improvements to Junction 11 of the M11 as soon as possible, as a standalone project.

The Joint Assembly also unanimously:

- (a) **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board notes the findings of the technical report.
- (b) **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board notes that the outcome of the A428/A1303 (Madingley Rise and Madingley Road) corridor and Western Orbital scheme development work will be the key determinant in considering the future recommended bus priority options in the locations set out in the report, in respect of Junction 13 of the M11.

## **6 (b) Greater Cambridge City Deal financial monitoring**

Consideration was given to a report which provided the Joint Assembly with the financial monitoring position for the period ending 31 August 2015.

Chris Malyon, Chief Finance Officer at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report and took Members through the capital programme for the first five years of the City Deal Partnership, revenue expenditure via the three partner Councils' New Homes Bonus contributions and expenditure from the non-project pool. The report highlighted that there was a degree of uncertainty around whether the New Homes Bonus would survive the

forthcoming Comprehensive Spending Review. It had therefore been agreed to adopt a relatively prudent approach to the utilisation of this pooled resource and not to exceed commitments beyond the availability of the relative New Homes Bonus for 2015/16.

Mr Malyon reflected on the difficulty of providing accurate projections for the cost of capital schemes over the initial five year City Deal programme. He explained that profiling for a capital programme of £180 million, which was in excess of the resources available, over the life of the first tranche of funding had provided some initial challenges. Mr Malyon was confident that more accurate projections would be available early next year.

Reference was made to the City Deal project expenditure spreadsheet appended to the report which was headed as being cumulative, whereas the figures included in the document suggested that they were not cumulative. It was noted that this was a mistake, which would be corrected when presented to the Executive Board on 1 October 2015.

In noting that very little revenue expenditure had been spent to date, it was reported that a significant proportion of this was in relation to the recruitment of staff and the fact that a number of positions had not yet been appointed to. It was agreed that future financial monitoring reports would outline those posts where appointments had been made, providing information on their respective roles, and also set out how many posts still needed to be recruited to.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, asked for clarification over the statement made in relation to reported uncertainty of future revenue funding and its impact on staffing. Mr Malyon stated that all current revenue spending commitments were supported for up to five years by the 2015/16 contributions already made by the three Councils and that appointments were being made in that context. The question of uncertainty surrounded future contributions based on the New Homes Bonus, but this would only potentially impact existing commitments if they extended beyond five years or any additional commitments.

Discussion ensued on the revenue funding that had been approved, as it was unclear in the report whether this formed part of the City Deal budget. Mr Malyon stated that the funding put in place for the skills project did now form part of the City Deal budget and confirmed that future financial monitoring reports would make this clearer.

In answer to a question regarding receipt of the City Deal grant from government, it was noted that the first grant had been received in May 2015 and was currently being held in Cambridgeshire County Council's bank account. £20 million would be delivered each subsequent year for tranche one. New Homes Bonus contributions from each partner Council were held by the respective authority.

Joint Assembly Members noted that £2.2 million of New Homes Bonus contributions from the three partner Councils was currently available in the non-project resource pool as unallocated funding. A list of suggested areas where this funding could be invested was set out in the report, but it would need to be used on an activity relevant to facilitating or pursuing the growth of the high value Greater Cambridge economy and developing streamlined decision making, consistent with the principles of the City Deal. It was highlighted, however, that the amount available may change as a consequence of the Comprehensive Spending Review.

A question was asked about the availability of resources to support the Joint Assembly in pursuing its own work programme to support that of the Executive Board's with regard to the development of the City Deal. It was confirmed that the above non-project resource pool could in principle be used for this purpose, subject to a decision of the Board.

The Joint Assembly unanimously **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board:

- (a) Notes the financial position as at 31 August 2015.
- (b) Agrees to the funding of the on-going revenue commitments, as set out in the report.
- (c) Agrees the proposed framework for considering new proposals to be funded from the non-project resources pool.

#### **6 (c) Greater Cambridge City Deal workstream update**

The Joint Assembly considered a briefing note which provided an update on each of the key City Deal workstreams. In discussing each workstream the following additional points were noted:

##### **Communications**

It was reported that the first round of recruitment for the Communications Manager post had not identified a suitable candidate, so a second round had recently been launched with the position having now been re-advertised.

##### **Economic development and promotion**

It was noted that Jonathan Brech had recently been appointed as Cambridge Development Director, working with Cambridge Network, rather than Cambridge Ahead as stated in the briefing note. It was suggested that Mr Brech should be invited to attend a future meeting of the Joint Assembly.

##### **Governance**

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman, provided an update following a recent informal meeting he had attended with the Executive Board in respect of the governance of the Joint Assembly and Executive Board, together with the relationship between the two bodies. At that meeting he had informed Board Members that he was pleased the Joint Assembly's recommendations were being given due consideration as part of the Executive Board's deliberations and that points made by the Assembly were being discussed and debated by Board Members before making decisions.

The work programmes of the two bodies were discussed at the meeting and a protocol had been developed by officers to assist the Joint Assembly, in particular, in being able to develop its own work programme to support that of the Executive Board's.

Discussion ensued on the status of the City Deal Partnership and whether it was still the intention to progress the Partnership as a Combined Authority, as had been originally stated when the Joint Assembly and Executive Board were first established. It was noted that this would involve a change in primary legislation, the consideration of which by Parliament had been delayed. It was proposed by Councillor Francis Burkitt and agreed that Councillor Bick, in his capacity as Chairman of the Joint Assembly, should write to the local Members of Parliament to seek their support in moving this issue forward.

## Housing

Reference was made to the inaugural meeting of the Housing Development Agency Shadow Board scheduled to be held in late September. It was agreed that officers would circulate the date and time of this meeting to Members of the Joint Assembly.

## Skills

It was noted that a report on skills, to include the governance arrangements behind the Skills Service, was scheduled to be considered by the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in December 2015.

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the City Deal workstream update report.

## 7. GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL FORWARD PLAN AND SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS

The Joint Assembly considered the City Deal Forward Plan and its schedule of meetings.

Councillor Bridget Smith referred to an item in the Forward Plan entitled 'congestion in Cambridge'. She had noted through the media that a lot of innovative suggestions and ideas were being put forward to resolve the issue of congestion in Cambridge and was keen that these were considered as part of the City Deal process in order that some of them could potentially be included as part of the public consultation.

Graham Hughes, Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, stated that the Executive Board had agreed to start the process by meeting with the City's key traffic generators, which had yet to take place. The item would initially be considered by the Executive Board at its meeting in January 2016 where broader discussions could be held to determine how the consultation process took shape.

Councillor Smith was very keen to ensure that the Joint Assembly and Executive Board did not miss out on this opportunity to engage with local people or ignore positive and innovative ideas being put forward. She felt that it was very important for local people to feel positive about the City Deal and that by listening to these suggestions at this stage provided a very good opportunity to facilitate that. Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, agreed to take this forward with the Vice-Chairman in liaison with officers.

Councillor Bick took this opportunity to invite Members of the Joint Assembly to consider other items to put forward for potential consideration at future meetings.

The Joint Assembly **AGREED:**

- (a) That it would investigate the leading models of traffic management to reduce congestion in the City, with any recommendations being passed onto the Executive Board, and asked the Chairman and Vice-Chairman to liaise with officers to pursue consideration of this issue.
- (b) That Members of the Joint Assembly submit any other suggestions for future discussion topics to the Chairman for consideration at future meetings.

---

**The Meeting ended at 12.23 p.m.**

---