



**GREATER  
CAMBRIDGE  
CITY DEAL**

Securing future prosperity

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

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly held on  
Thursday, 3 November 2016 at 4.00 p.m.

PRESENT:

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

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

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

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

### **Officers/advisors:**

Stephen Kelly	Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council
Mike Davies	Cambridgeshire County Council
Chris Malyon	Cambridgeshire County Council
Bob Menzies	Cambridgeshire County Council
Aaron Blowers	City Deal Partnership
Joanna Harrall	City Deal Partnership
Tanya Sheridan	City Deal Partnership
Alan Carter	Housing Development Agency
Stella Cockerill	Local Enterprise Partnership
Graham Watts	South Cambridgeshire District Council

## **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

No apologies for absence had been received.

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

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 29 September 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

### 3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Bridget Smith declared an interest in item 9 as she had commissioned Form the Future, who were referred to in the report, to undertake some work on behalf of the charity 'Forward Gamlingay'.

Councillor Dave Baigent declared an interest in item 8 as he lived in close proximity to the Chisholm Trail and was a member of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign.

### 4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

It was noted that a public question had been received in relation to the Chisholm Trail, which was the subject of item 8 at this meeting. It was therefore agreed that the question would be put as part of item 8.

#### **Question by Councillor Susan Van de Ven**

Cambridgeshire County Councillor Susan Van de Ven thanked the Joint Assembly and Executive Board for their support in respect of the A10 Cambridge to Royston cycleway. Although that scheme missed out on tranche one funding, she said that its serious consideration at the time meant that the scheme was scoped out in detail which exposed its strong potential to make a difference to modal shift away from car use which, in turn, helped mitigate against increasing traffic congestion. Councillor Van de Ven reported that this had helped attract Cycling Ambition funding worth approximately £3 million for the Harston, Foxton and Shepreth links and highlighted that she had attended the sod cutting ceremony for the City Deal funded Shepreth to Melbourn segment which brought the overall Cambridge to Royston scheme much closer to realisation.

Councillor Van de Ven explained that the following would be necessary to complete the overall A10 cycle scheme:

- further pressing for funding for the final cycle link segment connecting Melbourn and Royston, which represented a key micro-economic zone with a cluster of very significant employment centres. Councillor Van de Ven said that strong localised travel to work flows had been identified and she was encouraged that the Local Enterprise Partnership was working on funding opportunities, emphasising that this needed support from all quarters;
- Foxton level crossing was becoming an ever increasing obstruction to everything that moved on the A10 corridor, including the new cycleway, and Councillor Van de Ven expressed her disappointment that Network Rail had shelved its feasibility study to close the crossing and build a bypass with a bridge or underpass. The level crossing was on the City Deal's list of key components for unlocking sustainable transport potential along the A10 corridor and she therefore hoped that the Joint Assembly and Executive Board could put their weight behind encouraging Network Rail to properly address the crossing.

Councillor Van de Ven took this opportunity to report what was happening locally to help the area's potential for local and regional travel.

It was noted that the Meldreth, Shepreth and Foxton Community Rail Partnership comprised of County and District Councillors, representatives of the rail industry and was supported by organisations such as Railfuture, AstraZeneca, Melbourn Science Park and

Shepreth Wildlife Park. She reported that, through the Partnership, the Wildlife Park had brokered a discount admission ticket for people arriving at Shepreth by train, with 10% of its visitors now arriving by that means, and that Melbourn Science Park now operated a shuttle bus to and from Meldreth Station due to it having run out of car parking space. She added, however, that none of these stations had any shuttle bus turning facilities or bus service connections, stating that the three stations were experiencing a 10% increase in footfall every year. She was concerned that there were no plans to upgrade these stations as transport interchanges to meet modern demand, stating that improving access to these stations was clearly set out in the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Transport Strategy.

Councillor Van de Ven reported that the Community Rail Partnership had commissioned Railfuture to carry out an audit of the three stations which had now been published and provided a comprehensive overview of necessary work to modernise the stations. She suggested that a next step, which could unlock funding for station infrastructure improvement, was that of station travel planning and therefore asked the Joint Assembly if it would consider supporting this.

Councillor Bridget Smith understood that when the Foxton level crossing scheme had been originally considered alongside tranche 1 priority schemes, the Assembly and Board was informed that this particular scheme would be funded by Network Rail. She sought clarity as to whether this was no longer the case, and if not, whether this scheme should be re-introduced within the tranche 1 programme.

Councillor van de Ven confirmed that it had been the initial intention of Network Rail to fund this scheme, but that this had fallen through. She was keen for the scheme to be re-prioritised as part of the City Deal's programme.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, highlighted that the City Deal's tranche 2 programme was scheduled for consideration at the next cycle of meetings of the Assembly and Executive Board and expected this scheme to be included as part of the report associated with that item.

## 5. PETITIONS

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** two petitions received in relation to city centre access and congestion and **DEFERRED** consideration of these petitions to the meeting of the Joint Assembly scheduled to be held on 18 January 2017, to coincide with a report on city centre access and congestion scheduled for submission to that meeting.

## 6. CITY DEAL FORWARD PLAN

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

Councillor Maurice Leeke queried whether changes to the scheduling of the item entitled 'city access and tackling peak time congestion', now due for consideration at the January cycle of meetings, was as a consequence of the last meeting of the Executive Board or the subsequent statement by the Chairman of the Board. He also sought clarity as to what the item entitled 'change control process' entailed.

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, explained that the changes had occurred to the 'city access and tackling peak time congestion' item as a result of the necessary analysis of significant consultation responses to the proposed measures, including Peak Congestion Control Points and the Workplace Parking Levy. There would not be time to

give sufficient consideration to over 10,000 responses that had been received in accordance with the scheme's original programme so a decision had been made to refer the item to the January 2017 cycle of meetings.

The change control item would look at project management principles across the City Deal programme, similar to the way in which the City Deal's Risk Management Strategy had recently been considered and approved by the Joint Assembly and Board. This would enable the process to be formalised and placed into the public domain, setting a clear process for managing changes that may occur within specific projects.

Councillor Dave Baigent queried what the 'tranche 2 initial prioritisation' item scheduled for consideration at the next meeting would consist of. Tanya Sheridan reminded Members that the Joint Assembly and Executive Board considered a long list of schemes for inclusion as part of the tranche 1 programme in January 2015. The report for tranche 2 at the next meeting of the Assembly and Board would solely set out the process as to how schemes would be assessed and considered for the tranche 2 programme, rather than giving consideration to the inclusion of specific schemes at this stage.

Councillor Baigent queried whether consideration would be given to light railway schemes as part of the second tranche of the programme. Tanya Sheridan reported that the City Deal was co-investing in a piece of research work regarding shuttles and light railway systems. She said that it would be important to have that analysis and better understand how such modes of transport could be used as part of the local transport network.

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

## **7. CITY DEAL PROGRESS REPORT**

The Joint Assembly considered the City Deal progress report and a separate report which provided specific information regarding the Smarter Cambridge programme.

It was noted that a developer for the 'app' associated with the Smarter Cambridge programme had been procured and was a local Cambridge company.

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the City Deal progress report and separate report on the Smart Cambridge programme.

## **8. THE CHISHOLM TRAIL**

The Joint Assembly 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 Assembly 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.

### **Question by Sir John Sulston**

Sir John Sulston, representing Cambridge Past, Present and Future, reported that his organisation had consistently supported the idea of the Chisholm Trail since its original conception for an off-road cycleway connecting the main railway station with the Science Park.

He reported that Cambridge Past, Present and Future had been in discussion with officers and their consultants over the alignment of possible routes where the trail would pass the grade I Leper Chapel and the Chapel Meadows, which were a city wildlife site. As a result, the original site of the underpass beneath Newmarket Road had been moved approximately 60 metres closer to Coldham's Brook so that it no longer exited directly opposite the Chapel. With sympathetic landscaping, which was still to be agreed, he reported that Cambridge Past, Present and Future was comfortable with the proposed route as well as the vehicle and disabled access off Newmarket Road. It was also comfortable with the alignment of the trail along the eastern boundary of the Meadows, along the woodland edge of the Brook.

It was noted that Cambridge Past, Present and Future saw the trail as a opportunity to enhance the public awareness and visibility of the Chapel, and improve public access. He was keen to progress negotiations with officers for landscaping and to agree the terms and conditions for the construction of the trail. Sir John therefore asked when the County Council expected to allocate a landscape architect to the project with whom to finalise the landscaping details.

Mike Davies took this opportunity to thank Cambridge Past, Present and Future for its support and confirmed that discussions were still ongoing with the organisation regarding the development of the scheme. He reported that once planning consent had been obtained a lot of the details could then be finalised, stating that discussions with Cambridge Past, Present and Future would continue. It was noted that landscape experts were already part of the project team.

Claire Ruskin queried reference in the report under 'reasons for recommendation' to the scheme offering a high cost/benefit. It was noted that this should had read high benefit-cost ratio and was one of the contributing factors to recommending approval of the scheme's delivery.

Helen Valentine requested that Angia Ruskin Univeristy be included in the plan of trip generators as part of this scheme. Mr Davies confirmed that the Univeristy would be included.

Councillor Tim Bick said that it was very gratifying to see progress being made, together with the valuable support and collaboration with Cambridge Past, Present and Future. He referred to a new element of the scheme that had arisen, however, in respect of phase 2 of its development. It was noted that the current plan was still to deliver routes on the east and west side of the rail line from Coldham's Lane to link up to Cambridge railway station, which required the use of Network Rail land associated with Ridgeons and the City Depot site. Councillor Bick noted, with disappointment, that the project team was effectively constrained by the pace of developments and negotiations with Network Rail in terms of its potential future aspirations for its land, which would possibly be retained for rail

purposes such as overnight storage of crossrail rolling stock. Councillor Bick asked for some clarity as to the length of time officers expected to wait for confirmation from Network Rail until they considered investigating an alternative way of delivering phase 2 of the scheme.

Councillor Bick was also surprised to see a proposal in the report for a bridge starting or ending at the Ridgeons development, when officers in the past had recommended that this was not possible due to there not being enough room.

Mr Davies reported that discussions had been held with Network Rail for some time regarding the land associated with phase 2 of the scheme. This issue was taking considerable time to resolve with Network Rail and he did not think it was 100% likely that the land needed from Network Rail to progress with the scheme as originally planned would be obtained. He reported that this had resulted in officers considering the options available, with the proposed bridge set out in the report being an alternative option at this stage. Officers currently working on the project, having undertaken high-level analysis, felt that there was room for a bridge in this location but Mr Davies emphasised that detailed studies had not yet been commissioned.

It was noted that officers would seek some clarity from Network Rail as to when a final decision on this issue was likely to be forthcoming.

Councillor Dave Baigent referred to Plan 3 of the report which indicated the footprint for a possible bridge location. He was concerned that local residents would feel threatened by such a vague approach as it was unclear from the footprint whether the bridge would encroach on the gardens of properties already in that area. He questioned whether the map should be slightly more precise in that respect.

Mr Davies said that this aspect of the scheme was at a very early stage. The proposed footprint for a bridge had been deliberately drawn up in this way as officers were not sure yet specifically where a bridge would be located in this area. He emphasised that this issue would need to go out to public consultation, but was of the opinion that it would have a minimal impact with both sides of the proposed bridge being part of new developments, rather than existing houses and gardens.

Helen Valentine asked whether the land currently owned by Network Rail could be obtained through a Compulsory Purchase Order. Mr Davies confirmed that, theoretically, it could although it would be necessary to demonstrate that there were not any alternative options. He felt that the scheme would have a weak argument in that respect.

Councillor Bick acknowledged the point regarding the two ends of the bridge being located in new developments, therefore not impacting existing houses and gardens, but put forward a further concern that the bridge could potentially use up valuable land needed to deliver much needed housing in the city. He did not want to see any delays in the delivery of these new homes as a result of this part of the scheme and found it difficult to understand how this could all be delivered together, without knowing Network Rail's decision and knowing with some certainty whether the bridge would be necessary.

Mr Davies reminded the Assembly that, ultimately, the Board would be asked for permission to consult on options for a new bridge if this was felt to be a useful way of completing all of the links in phase 2 of the scheme's development.

Councillor Hickford agreed to convey the concerns raised at this meeting to the Executive Board at its meeting on 10 November 2016.

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

- (a) Notes the scheme progress being made in terms of planning approval, land procurement and stakeholder engagement.
- (b) Approves construction of phase one of the scheme, subject to gaining planning permission.
- (c) Delegates powers to approve the construction contract and selection of contractor for phase one to the Cambridgeshire County Council's Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Executive Board.
- (d) Supports the continuation of land negotiations.

## **9. BUILDING A LOCALLY RESPONSIVE SKILLS SYSTEM - PROGRESS UPDATE**

The Joint Assembly 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.

Stella Cockerill 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 provided an update on behalf of the Joint 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. The Service was being delivered for the City Deal Partnership by Form the Future and managed on the Partnership's behalf by the Local Enterprise Partnership. 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. He made the point that this part of the employer base, where there was a real tradition of investing in apprenticeships, was probably smaller than in many other areas by virtue of the correspondingly larger role played by graduates. The area also had a disproportionately larger number of small and medium sized employers who, separately, lacked the critical mass to assert their demand for training programmes unless they could aggregate that demand together.

Councillor Bick highlighted that the report provided a review of the contract performance of the Skills Service and mapped out its direction of the next two years, adding Careers Champions in schools and moving towards an outcomes emphasis. He added that the report sought approval to fund a negotiated intervention at Cambridge Regional College, designed to improve the reach-out to employers to help them with training needs analysis and reinforce their growth sector focus, as well as support them in aggregation of demand for certain types of programme. Councillor Bick said that, importantly, this was targeted to start from January 2017 to be in place for year one of the new funding and curricular landscape.

Another important aspect of the report, noted by Councillor Bick, was that it refined the approach to measurement of the City Deal's contribution to the skills system, by revisiting the City Deal agreement and interpreting it for the real world and the changes that had been introduced. In terms of apprenticeship numbers, it recognised that if businesses were demanding additional apprentices they were likely to be doing so for reasons of growth, which would therefore be a growth sector in its own right. He emphasised that growth sectors were not only the hi-tech companies, but the construction companies which built their industrial units, houses and roads and those companies which met the needs of the enlarged population for many other services. Councillor Bick was of the opinion that this would not change the priority the City Deal placed on the technology and life sciences sector, which remained the original drivers of growth. He understood that the Government would be supportive of the City Deal partnership taking this approach, and felt that it was sensible to adopt it.

Sir Michael Marshall questioned whether the Skills Service had engaged with Launchpad, which was an organisation covering a range of companies in Cambridge in parallel with resources such as careers guidance officers. He asked whether a list could be collated of those companies in the area who were taking on apprenticeships so that it was clear where they were being employed.

Stella Cockerill responded by saying that the Skills Service was seeking to utilise what was already in place. She was aware of different providers operating in the area but explained that the difficulty was that they did not have to inform the Skills Service about what they were doing or who they were engaging with. She accepted that the Service may not be working with Launchpad as closely as it could be and was happy to explore this further. In terms of information relating to employers and the apprenticeships they employed, she explained that this information was not published and was not something that the Service would have access to.

Sir Michael made the point that, in his experience, employers would be very willing to share information relating to the apprenticeships they employed.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, queried whether apprenticeships solely in those STEM based growth sectors originally selected as priorities for the City Deal should be counted towards the City Deal's target, or whether this should be widened to include other sectors.

Councillor Bridget Smith felt that the remit of the City Deal and the skills workstream was to increase uptake, engagement and standards. She was concerned that opening the remit too widely could dilute the impact of the investment and therefore felt that the focus should be on the higher and medium category apprenticeships, as set out in the table under paragraph 31 of the report.

Andy Williams, as a Member of the Skills Sub-Group, provided clarity that the Sub-Group was recommending that the City Deal's resources be dedicated to the higher and medium category apprenticeships, but that all apprenticeships should be recorded and counted towards the City Deal's target. He made the point that small companies all over the area were actively employing apprenticeships, which was extremely positive for the City Deal and the wider area in terms of economic growth, emphasising that the key issue was where the resources would be focussed.

Discussion ensued on the significance of the construction industry in the area, particularly in light of the considerable development occurring in Greater Cambridge. It was noted that construction currently featured under the Skills Service's medium apprenticeship category.

Stella Cockerill reported that the three most popular apprenticeship subjects nationally were business administration, engineering and retail and explained that, at the moment, the Local Enterprise Partnership had no way of knowing how many business administrative apprenticeships, for example, were employed directly within the City Deal's priority sectors. She explained that this was the key issue which therefore supported the need to ensure that all apprenticeships were recorded and counted towards the City Deal's target.

Further to a question by Councillor Smith regarding key performance indicators, Stella Cockerill confirmed that these would be reviewed, agreeing that they needed to be more outcome focused as well as be based on what the Skills Service was actually being asked to deliver.

Councillor Smith, in her capacity as a South Cambridgeshire District Councillor, questioned how the Skills Service could ensure any offer was fair and equitable across the whole region. It was noted that this aspect of the Service, together with the ongoing dialogue with providers and deliverability, would be addressed as part of the Area Review.

Mark Robertson declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest at this stage of the meeting as an employee of Cambridge Regional College and left the meeting prior to the vote on this item.

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

- (a) Extends Form the Future's contract for a further 12 months, from September 2017 to August 2018.
- (b) Sets aside £160,000 for the academic year 2017/18 and assumes a continuation of funding for a brokerage service in 2018/19 at approximately the same funding level.
- (c) Reviews the focus and targets for the period 2017/18 and begins contract negotiations along these lines;
- (d) Sets aside £35,000 for the period January to December 2017 and assumes a continuation of this into 2018 to develop Career Champions in schools.
- (e) Endorses 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 supports the work of the Local Skills Service and National Careers Service.
- (f) Begins 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) Endorses 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) Endorses this approach to recording and monitoring the additional skills related to outcomes in the City Deal.

## **10. GREATER CAMBRIDGE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AGENCY - SIX MONTH UPDATE**

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

Alan Carter, Managing Director of the Housing Development Agency, 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.

Mr Carter reported that the Agency had recently secured permission for schemes in Gamlingay and Great Abingdon and confirmed that applications would shortly be submitted for schemes in Shepreth and Willingham.

Helen Valentine queried Cambridgeshire County Council's commitment to the Housing Development Agency in view of paragraph 27 of the report which indicated that the authority had withdrawn four of its eight schemes in the programme. Mr Carter confirmed that the County Council was still committed to the Agency but said that it was progressing the development of its own housing company. In doing so it was considering which schemes could be delivered through the County Council's company alongside those schemes that could be delivered through the Housing Development Agency.

Councillor Bridget Smith corrected figures quoted in the appendix to the report regarding the Gamlingay scheme, confirming that the scheme did not include 14 affordable houses and that a proportion of them had been allocated as market housing.

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the report.

## 11. CITY DEAL FINANCIAL STRATEGY - 2016/2020

The Joint Assembly 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.

Discussion ensued on Section 106 Agreement contributions, with existing contributions received to date by the County Council totalling £4 million for transport related schemes. Councillor Bridget Smith referred to an assumption in Appendix A of the report that £20 million worth of Section 106 Agreement contributions for transport projects could be paid over the first tranche period based on new developments at Cambourne West and Bourn

Airfield. She felt that there was a small chance of Section 106 Agreement contributions being delivered as a result of these developments during the period of the first tranche. It was noted that negotiations regarding Cambourne West were currently ongoing and that no application had been received in respect of a development at Bourn Airfield. Ultimately, the planning authority's Planning Committee would agree any balance of Section 106 Agreement funding assigned to infrastructure.

Mr Malyon accepted the point, but clarified that the figures set out in Appendix A did not set out the totality of the situation with regard to Section 106 Agreement funding and omitted to include the significant sums associated with other aspects of development such as schools.

Discussion ensued on the proposed devolution deal. Mr Malyon made the point that an overarching Financial Strategy may include devolution funding alongside the City Deal, but this would solely be from an administrative and governance basis. He emphasised that City Deal funding could only be used for City Deal activity and would be completely separate to funding received as part of any devolution agreement.

The Joint Assembly **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board approves the Financial Strategy of the City Deal Partnership.

## 12. CITY DEAL FINANCIAL MONITORING

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

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the financial position as at 30 September 2016.

---

**The Meeting ended at 6.35 p.m.**

---