



## GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL JOINT ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly held on  
Friday, 13 November 2015 at 2.00 p.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 Noel Kavanagh	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Maurice Leeke	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Francis Burkitt	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Bridget Smith	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Nick Wright	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Sir Michael Marshall	Marshall Group
Claire Ruskin	Cambridge Network
Andy Williams	AstraZenica
Helen Valentine	Anglia Ruskin University

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

Councillor Lewis Herbert	Cambridge City Council and Chairman of the Executive Board
--------------------------	--

### Officers/advisors:

Andrew Limb	Cambridge City Council
Graham Hughes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Chris Malyon	Cambridgeshire County Council
Stuart Walmsley	Cambridgeshire County Council
Aaron Blowers	City Deal Partnership
Tanya Sheridan	City Deal Partnership
Adrian Cannard	Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership
Alex Colyer	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Graham Watts	South Cambridgeshire District Council

### 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman, took this opportunity to welcome Councillor Nick Wright to his first meeting of the City Deal Joint Assembly as one of South Cambridgeshire District Council's representatives, who had been appointed in place of Councillor Tim Wotherspoon. Councillor Bick agreed to write to Councillor Wotherspoon and thank him for his contributions, on behalf of the Assembly.

An apology for absence was received by Anne Constantine (Cambridge Regional College).

### 2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 7 October 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**

A request to speak had been received from Cambridgeshire County Councillor Susan van de Ven in respect of the prioritisation of schemes for tranche 2. It was agreed that Councillor van de Ven would make her speech during consideration of this issue under item 7.

### 5. **PETITIONS**

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** that a petition relating to the A428/A1303 Madingley Road corridor scheme had been considered by the Executive Board at its meeting on 3 November 2015. As the Executive Board had already received the petition and agreed to include it as a response as part of the public consultation process, it was agreed that there was no requirement for it to be considered again by the Joint Assembly.

### 6. **WESTERN ORBITAL - OPTIONS AND APPROVAL TO CONSULT**

The Joint Assembly considered a report which set out the early development work that had occurred for the Western Orbital project, together with a proposed timetable for further work to link with the emerging A428/A1303 Madingley Road corridor scheme.

Stuart Walmsley, Head of Major Infrastructure Delivery at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report and reminded Assembly Members that the Western Orbital had not been included in the list of prioritised schemes for tranche one of the City Deal, but was approved for early development as a tranche two scheme. There were strategic links between the Western Orbital and the A428/A1303 schemes, so there was a case for bringing forward work for the Western Orbital in order that full consideration could be given to the preferred option for each scheme.

Mr Walmsley emphasised that the scheme was at a very early stage in its development and presented a map, set out as Figure 1 in the report, providing the key locations within the Western Orbital study area and outlining the merits of the scheme. The report set out provisional options, including high-level key benefits and early estimated indicative costs. It was noted that the purpose of the project at this stage was to test acceptance of the scheme in terms of viability, deliverability, its business case and whether there were any commercial opportunities. A detailed feasibility assessment would form part of the next stage, including a public consultation on the principles of the scheme and further stakeholder engagement.

The following points were noted during discussion by Members of the Assembly and responses from officers:

- a question was asked about the justification behind the proposal for an additional Park and Ride at Junction 11 of the M11. Mr Walmsley explained that Park and Ride sites had historically been located on the fringes of the City. Development had now consumed some of those sites and an additional Park and Ride site in this location could intercept traffic flow at that point, helping alleviate congestion.

He reminded Members, however, that this was an early concept;

- reference was made to the Atkins Western Orbital technical options report and the fact that it set out the need to investigate use of accommodation bridges over the M11. A query was raised as to whether this issue could be resolved prior to commencing with the early stage public consultation, in terms of whether it was feasible. Officers confirmed that this would be addressed prior to the public consultation;
- the problem along this particular route was with the junctions and not specifically the carriageway, which should be made clearer to members of the public as part of the consultation. Mr Walmsley agreed that this was an important point but highlighted that an additional Park and Ride site in this area could also potentially make a huge difference;
- examples were given of pedestrian crossings, traffic lights and other traffic management measures having an impact on congestion along this route, which could potentially be changed or altered to address the problems. A suggestion was made that this should also feature as part of the consultation. Graham Hughes, Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, reminded Members of the Assembly that these measures were effectively a system and that any changes would have repercussions elsewhere within the network. As a result, he said that it was not as simple as making changes to specific traffic management measures as this would not provide a solution to the problem. He agreed to look into how this could be explained in the consultation document. Mr Walmsley gave an assurance that sophisticated modelling had been used in the development of the options, which took into account the impact of making changes to junctions and traffic management systems;
- a study had been carried out with employees based on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, which indicated how many people were commuting from the postcode areas of CB23 and CB24. It was noted that the results of this study would be shared with officers;
- it was positive that the report made reference to park and cycle, which should be more widely promoted and become a key part of all Park and Ride facilities;
- in view of the fact that the business case supporting the scheme would include or impact the commercial interests of bus operators, it would be interesting for the Joint Assembly to hear from operators to gain more of an understanding of issues from their perspective. Officers confirmed that operators would be a key player in the development of the business case and, subject to operators agreeing to meet with the Joint Assembly, supported the suggestion;
- the plan of working-up this project alongside the A428/A1303 Madingley Road corridor scheme was questioned in terms of how it would work in practice and whether it could potentially delay delivery of the A428/A1303 scheme. Mr Walmsley reported that officers always looked for value for money when assessing schemes and there were opportunities with these projects in respect of coming up with options and proposals to consider. He said that timing would be critical, but it made sense to test both schemes at the same time as this would help with continuity of ideas and proposals that could be worked collectively. The timeline for the Western Orbital scheme had not yet been confirmed but Mr Walmsley confirmed that this would not impact on the delivery of the A428/A1303 Madingley Road corridor scheme;
- all environmental issues should be made clear for future schemes at the earliest opportunity;
- in answer to a question about how growth was measured, it was noted that growth in the context of this scheme referred to traffic flows. Models were used which predicted traffic flow based on a number of aspects, including new development

sites and projected population numbers, in order that proposals could take into account future needs;

- reference was made to a planning application which affected a parcel of land that would impact the options set out in the report. A question was therefore asked as to whether this specific planning application had been taken into account and how this would impact delivery of the scheme. It was noted that officers could not pre-empt the outcome of a planning application. Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, reported that officers from the three partner Councils were aware of the application and it was being taken into account as the scheme was developed. She noted that the site in question had not been allocated in the draft Local Development Plans and remained unallocated in the proposals to be considered by Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils on 30 November 2015;
- in relation to option C in the report and the earlier statement that an additional Park and Ride site could intercept south-bound M11 traffic, it was suggested that a Park and Ride site on Huntingdon Road could also intercept that traffic. Regarding use of Park and Ride sites in general, in terms of promoting their use, it was noted that they needed to be used intuitively by people and as a result the location of such facilities would be key. In terms of intercepting traffic, Mr Walmsley said that the modelling exercise referred to earlier would be critical in properly understanding traffic movements. This would indicate whether a Park and Ride on Huntingdon Road would be necessary and so would be factored into the modelling work.

Members requested a report back to the Joint Assembly prior to the commencement of the early stage public consultation in order that it could consider the content of the consultation documentation and add value to the process. The consultation was originally scheduled to begin in February 2016, which did not fit in with the cycle of Joint Assembly and Executive Board meetings. It was reported that, as this was a tranche 2 scheme, a slight delay in starting the consultation would not cause any problems or delay its delivery, and was not time critical in respect of meeting the 2019 triggers for tranche 1. The Joint Assembly therefore agreed to recommend that a draft of the consultation documentation should be submitted to the February meeting of the Joint Assembly and March meeting of the Executive Board. Members of the Assembly also requested that an update report on investigation into the standalone project regarding Junction 11 of the M11, as agreed by the Executive Board on 1 October 2015, be included as part of the item for those meetings.

The Joint Assembly **RECOMMENDED** to the Executive Board that it:

- (a) Notes the findings from the early Western Orbital technical report.
- (b) Approves the development of further work on the scheme.
- (c) Notes the progress made on assessing standalone bus priority options for M11 Junction 11.
- (d) Amends the public consultation's timetable so that it commences in the Spring 2016, in order that a draft of the consultation document can be considered by the Joint Assembly and Executive Board at their February and March meetings respectively.

## 7. INITIAL PRIORITISATION OF SCHEMES FOR TRANCHE 2 - REPORT ON FURTHER

## **ECONOMIC APPRAISAL**

The Joint Assembly considered a report which outlined the proposed process and timescale for making decisions on priority schemes for tranche 2 of the City Deal infrastructure programme.

Stuart Walmsley, Cambridgeshire County Council's Head of Major Infrastructure Delivery, presented the report and reminded Assembly Members that the Executive Board had agreed to prioritise £180 million worth of projects in tranche 1 of the City Deal programme for the £100 million of grant funding available over that five year period. The schemes that remained from the indicative City Deal programme that were not prioritised for investment in tranche 1 were set out in the report at paragraph 8. It was emphasised that in addition to these schemes other proposals or schemes may come forward from the work underway on the Cambridge Access Study or from the Smart Cities project.

A proposed approach and timeline for the tranche 2 programme prioritisation was set out in table 1 of the report.

Councillor Susan van de Ven, Cambridgeshire County Councillor for the Meldreth division, referred to the Cambridge to Royston A10 cycle scheme that was not included in the final programme of prioritised schemes for the first tranche of City Deal funding. She highlighted the overwhelming support for the scheme from all eleven partners of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and over 100 other A10 businesses and education centres.

Councillor van de Ven said that the northern half of the route sat within a convenient radius of Cambridge, for funding purposes, and referred to funding that had been secured through the Cycling Ambition Grant to create a cycle and pedestrian link between Foxton and Harston. She reported that the southern half of the corridor between Royston and Melbourn had no infrastructure funding source, but stated that as this was a highly desirable corridor for modal shift it had received Local Sustainability Transport funding designed to work with businesses and residents to encourage a change in travel behaviour, which was now taking place through Travel for Cambridgeshire. She acknowledged that this natural transport corridor crossed county boundaries and reported that Cambridgeshire and Hertfordshire County Councillors and officers were working closely together on this issue. Furthermore, Councillors from both authorities had met with their respective Local Enterprise Partnerships, with the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership characterising the unfunded Melbourn to Royston segment as 'a missing link in a strong corridor scheme now taking shape'.

Councillor van de Ven said that local residents brought together by the A10 Corridor Cycling Campaign were now undertaking community fundraising in order to make the A10 cycle scheme better placed to attract match-funding. She and colleagues were therefore working to assemble as many resources as possible toward the realisation of this scheme and asked the Joint Assembly to support application of City Deal funding to ensure its completion.

Discussion ensued on the initial prioritisation of schemes for tranche 2, and Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman, proposed the inclusion of a scheme to the list of those carried over from the indicative City Deal programme on city centre bus and coach capacity management. Councillor Maurice Leeke proposed that the word 'Station' be removed from the scheme entitled 'Newmarket Road to Cambridge Science Park Station bus priority scheme' and Councillor Burkitt proposed a Huntingdon Road Park and Ride scheme be added. The Joint Assembly supported these proposals.

Mr Walmsley reminded the Joint Assembly that this report sought to set out the process

that would be followed for prioritising schemes for inclusion in tranche 2 of the City Deal programme. He said that the programme would consist of major projects that required significant planning, organisation and consultation. In answer to a question regarding the deliverability of the tranche 1 programme, Mr Walmsley said that good progress had been made and that City Deal partners were committed to getting those schemes right. He said that work and planning for the tranche 2 programme at this stage would have no impact at all on deliverability of those schemes in tranche 1. He therefore fully expected the tranche 1 programme to be delivered in accordance with the timescales that had been set.

It was noted that the Joint Assembly, and subsequently the Executive Board, would have further opportunities to influence the specific schemes that would make up the tranche 2 programme.

The Joint Assembly **RECOMMENDED** to the Executive Board that it:

- (a) Approves the process and timescales for agreeing the tranche 2 prioritised infrastructure improvement programme.
- (b) Approves preparatory work to support and inform tranche 2 decisions, including scheme assessment and interim work for the Local Plans regarding Cambridge Northern Fringe East, and approve funding from the prioritised 'tranche 2 programme development' budget to cover one third of the Cambridge Northern Fringe East work (estimated at £70,000) as part of the pipeline work.
- (c) Agrees to make the following amendments to the list of schemes set out in paragraph 8 of the report:
  - the removal of the word 'Station' in respect of the Newmarket Road to Cambridge Science Park Station bus priority scheme;
  - the addition of a city centre bus and coach capacity management scheme;
  - the addition of a Huntingdon Road Park and Ride scheme.

## 8. **WORKSTREAM UPDATE**

The Joint Assembly considered a briefing note which set out updates for each City Deal workstream and took this opportunity to consider the Greater Cambridge City Deal Forward Plan.

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, presented the briefing note and highlighted the following points:

- the Skills Service contract had been extended, further details of which would be reported under item 9 at this meeting;
- the bid submitted as part of the 'Innovate UK Internet of Things' competition under the Smarter Cambridgeshire workstream had progressed to the final bidding round. The Smarter Cambridgeshire business case would be considered by the Joint Assembly and Executive Board at their February and March meetings, respectively;
- the A1307 corridor scheme would now be reported to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board later than anticipated and was also scheduled for inclusion on agendas for the February and March meetings, respectively;
- recruitment for the Strategic Communications Manager position was ongoing, with the post still currently out for advert;
- the Joint Assembly meeting in December and subsequent Executive Board

meeting on 15 January 2016 would consider the outcomes of the call for evidence sessions in relation to City centre congestion.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Vice-Chairman, requested clarity over what the A1307 scheme consisted of, as he felt that the title of the scheme and commentary included in the briefing note did not quite reflect the entirety of the scheme he believed the Joint Assembly and Executive Board had supported. He was also concerned that this scheme had been further delayed. Graham Hughes, Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, understood Councillor Hickford's concerns, but explained that a huge amount of work had been undertaken by consultants which was not yet in a format or of a standard appropriate for reporting into the Joint Assembly or Executive Board to enable sufficient consideration of the issues in order to properly take decisions. He was confident that the revised schedule would be met and agreed to speak to his team in respect of the details of the scheme to ensure that its specification met with what the Executive Board had approved.

Councillor Bridget Smith informed the Assembly that she had recently met with the Head of Strategic Housing at Cambridge City Council who, further to the last meeting, had given her reassurance in respect of the housing workstream. She made the point that there were lots of opportunities to deliver housing within the City itself, so it should be made clear that housing delivery would not solely occur on rural exception sites.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman, referred to the issue of governance and the anticipation that the City Deal would pursue the establishment of a Combined Authority. He asked for an update to the Joint Assembly on progress in the formation of a Greater Cambridge Combined Authority, embracing the City Deal, and its relationship to the other current agenda for a Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority.

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

## **9. SIX-MONTHLY REPORT ON SKILLS**

The Joint Assembly considered a report which outlined progress towards a Skills Service for the Greater Cambridge area.

Graham Hughes, Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council presented the report and highlighted that the Skills Service would help to achieve the City Deal objective of promoting at least an additional 420 apprenticeships in key areas of need over the first five years of the City Deal and generally increase the employability of young people. He reported that 'Form the Future' had been appointed to deliver the Skills Service following a tendering process and that it was preparing to launch the service now that the contract had been signed.

It was noted that routine monitoring of the progress of the service against the achievement of the core objectives would be undertaken by an Advisory Group comprising the City Deal Joint Assembly sub-group with update reports to the Assembly and Board when necessary.

Appended to the report was a set of key performance indicators for the Skills Service, which had been agreed as part of finalising the contract with Form the Future. Members of the Assembly agreed that the sub-group should discuss these key performance indicators in more detail with the professionals concerned, as well as consider other aspects of the skills agenda such as supply matching local demand rather than focussing on activity.

Councillor Francis Burkitt asked how the additional 420 apprenticeships were assessed in

terms of what quantified them as being additional to those that would have already been in place without the skills workstream of the City Deal. Mr Hughes reported that data from the Skills Funding Agency was used to assess the number of additional apprenticeships, but he agreed to circulate a comprehensive answer to this question outside of the meeting to clarify the way in which these additional apprenticeships were calculated.

It was suggested that Form for Future be invited to a future meeting of the Joint Assembly to provide a presentation on how it intended to take the Skills Service forward.

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the six-monthly report and progress towards the establishment of a Greater Cambridgeshire Skills Service.

**10. GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL FORWARD PLAN**

Consideration was given to the Greater Cambridge City Deal Forward Plan, which the Joint Assembly **NOTED**.

---

**The Meeting ended at 4.23 p.m.**

---