



GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP

Growing and sharing prosperity

Delivering our City Deal

GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP JOINT ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
Wednesday 28 February 2018 at 2.00pm

PRESENT:

Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly:

Councillor Kevin Price	Cambridge City Council (Chairman)
Councillor Tim Wotherspoon	Cambridgeshire County Council (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Dave Baigent	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Tim Bick	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Noel Kavanagh	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor John Williams	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Kevin Cuffley	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Grenville Chamberlain	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Bridget Smith	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Andy Williams	AstraZeneca
Helen Valentine	Anglia Ruskin University
Dr John Wells	Cancer Research UK Cambridge Institute
Christopher Walkinshaw	Cambridge Ahead

Members or substitutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board in attendance:

Councillor Ian Bates, GCP Transport Portfolio Holder Cambridgeshire County Council

Officers/advisors:

Peter Blake	Director of Transport, Greater Cambridge Partnership
Niamh Matthews	Strategic Programme and Commissioning Manager
Rachel Stopard	Chief Executive, Greater Cambridge Partnership
Kathrin John	Democratic Services, South Cambridgeshire District Council

1. APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was received from Mark Robertson.

An apology for late arrival was received from Councillor Ian Bates.

2. JOINT ASSEMBLY MEMBERSHIP

The Chairperson welcomed Christopher Walkinshaw, of Cambridge Ahead, to his first meeting of the Joint Assembly. Sir Michael Marshall had stepped down from the Joint Assembly and Mr Walkinshaw had been appointed in place of Sir Michael as a representative of the business community.

The Chairperson, on behalf of the Joint Assembly, placed on record his thanks to Sir Michael for his contributions to the Greater Cambridge Partnership during his period of service as a member of the Joint Assembly.

The Chairperson further reported that Claire Ruskin had been appointed on an interim basis to the Executive Board and that there was accordingly a vacancy on the Joint Assembly. The Executive Board had supported a proposal for Claire Ruskin to identify someone from the business community to fill the vacancy on an interim basis.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No interests were declared.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 18 January 2018 were approved as a correct record, subject to amendment of minute 10 (Rural Travel Hubs) to capture comments made at the meeting that there did not appear to be sufficient confidence to develop permanent design solutions at the pilot sites, given the proposal for construction at those sites to be initially more temporary in nature, and to reservations expressed about whether it was prudent to invest significant funding in sites if they were only temporary.

5. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Nine public questions had been received, all of which had been accepted for the meeting.

Eight questions related to agenda item 7 (Histon Road, Bus, Cycling and Walking Improvements Final Concept) and seven of those were dealt with at that item. One questioner was unable to attend the meeting and would receive a written response.

One question related to agenda item 8 (Western Orbital: Progress on Additional Park and Ride Capacity and Submission to Highways England on Girton Interchange and M11 Smart Motorway) and was dealt with in conjunction with that item.

6. PETITIONS

The Chairperson notified the Joint Assembly of a petition received to “reject the Cambridge Mass Transit Options Report as flawed and incomplete”. The petition contained more than 50 signatures but had not reached the required 500 signatures to present it formally to the Joint Assembly.

7. HISTON ROAD: BUS, CYCLING AND WALKING IMPROVEMENTS FINAL CONCEPT

The Chairperson invited Lillian Rundblad, Chair of the Histon Road Residents' Association and Deputy Chair of the Local Liaison Forum (LLF) to ask the two questions in her name and three questions on behalf of other residents. He then invited Matthew Danish of Camcycle and Michael Page to ask their questions. A further question had been received from the Windsor Road Residents' Association and, as the questioners were not present, the Chairperson noted that a written response would be sent. Details of all questions and a summary of the answers given, are set out in Appendix A to these minutes.

The GCP Director of Transport presented the report which set out the preliminary concept design for Histon Road. The design met the original objectives of the scheme and also

took into account the considerable public engagement that had taken place since the consultation on the previous options. Approval was sought to consult on the proposed design in the spring of 2018 and, following analysis of the consultation, it was proposed to bring the final preliminary design back for consideration by the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in late 2018. The Director of Transport drew attention to on-going dialogue with the LLF and noted that further engagement would take place in order that feedback could be provided to the GCP Executive Board on 21 March 2018.

During discussion on the report:-

- Helen Valentine noted that the costs of the project appeared to have escalated significantly. In response, the Director of Transport acknowledged that whilst the original estimate had been too low, the revised cost estimate also reflected the new scheme priorities.
- Councillor Noel Kavanagh asked what measures would be taken to restrict deliveries, given that delivery vehicles prevented the free flow of traffic. He also echoed the point raised by one of the questioners around the need for pedestrians to have priority at side roads. The Director of Transport responded that delivery restrictions would need to be controlled by properly enforced traffic regulation orders. Additionally, he reported that the intention remained to provide pedestrian priority at side roads where visibility and other safety issues allowed.
- Councillor Bridget Smith indicated her broad support for the proposals but had a number of concerns including the impact on businesses; the need for additional cycle parking; the objective to “maintain or reduce general traffic levels”, given the original aim to reduce traffic levels by 10-15%; the small reduction in journey time of 2.5 minutes that the bus lane was expected to achieve and whether this outcome was worth the investment proposed; and the apparent wide cost benefit ratio range indicated in paragraph 3.15. In response, the Director of Transport indicated that further work to mitigate the impact of parking was ongoing; it was aimed to introduce cycle parking where appropriate; there was no one initiative that was a “magic bullet” to reduce traffic levels and congestion, but the scheme aimed to promote public transport, walking and cycling as an alternative by demonstrating to people that it was quicker and more reliable to use those options; he did not feel that 2.5 minutes was a small reduction in journey time and that it would be hugely valuable if such a time saving could be achieved on every journey across the network; and explained how the cost benefit analysis of the scheme had been undertaken, advising that benefit to cost ratio of 1.6 – 2.9 was within the expected range.
- Councillor Tim Bick indicated that the Joint Assembly was accustomed to seeing a more definitive level of detail before a scheme was put out to public consultation and noted that it was difficult to get a sense of the proposals from the circulated plans. He also was concerned about whether the LLF would still be able to influence the proposals before they went to consultation and suggested that the proper route would have been for consultation to have taken place with the LLF at an earlier stage in order that the Joint Assembly’s own consideration could have been informed by the LLF’s comments. The Director of Transport reported that the date of the LLF meeting to consider the proposals had been agreed in consultation with the LLF Chair and that there would still be an opportunity for feedback to be provided to the GCP Executive Board. There had been no intention to short cut the usual procedure.
- The Chairperson confirmed that the usual practice was for discussion to take place with the LLF in order to inform the Joint Assembly’s deliberations. The Director of Transport agreed to take on board the comments raised about process.
- Dr John Wells commented that the forward plan of decisions on page 62 indicated

that an outline business case for this project was due to be submitted to the Executive Board on 21 March 2018, but noted that no business case had been enclosed with the Joint Assembly's papers. He asked if the outline business case would be presented to the Executive Board. The Director of Transport reported that it was not anticipated that any additional information above that in the report before the Joint Assembly would be presented to the Executive Board.

- Councillor Tim Wotherspoon, the Vice-Chairperson, sought further clarification about the possible use of floating bus stops; with reference to paragraph 2.1(f), indicated that he was of the view that even maintaining current traffic levels on Histon Road would be a positive outcome; and welcomed the proposal in GA006 on page 21 to provide a better defined cross over point for vehicles wanting to cross the cycle lane to get into the left filter lane, as a potential safety enhancement. The Director of Transport noted that extensive work had been undertaken by the County Council on developing the current floating bus stop design, working with disability groups, cycling groups and other stakeholders and had concluded that zebra crossings should not be included in the design of floating bus stops and these were not currently included in any bus stops in the city. There would therefore be a concern about introducing them at one corridor in the city. This did not mean that such an option could never be pursued however and officers would continue to work with County Council colleagues on this.
- In response to a question from Councillor Bridget Smith, the Chief Executive provided an update on progress with the review of LLFs, noting that a facilitated workshop was due to be organised to follow up on the work with the Consultation Institute.

The Joint Assembly indicated its broad support for the proposals in the report to be presented to the Executive Board, subject to the concerns and comments above, with their views to be incorporated into the Chairperson's report to the Board.

8. WESTERN ORBITAL: PROGRESS ON ADDITIONAL PARK & RIDE CAPACITY; AND SUBMISSION TO HIGHWAYS ENGLAND ON GIRTON INTERCHANGE AND M11 SMART MOTORWAY

The Chairperson invited Mal Schofield to ask his question which related to this item and had been submitted in line with the provisions of Standing Orders. Details of the question and a summary of the answer are set out in Appendix A to the minutes.

The Director of Transport presented the report which outlined proposals for the development of the Western Orbital scheme and set out issues for public consultation in summer 2018 on a new Park and Ride (P&R) site at Junction 11 of the M11 and associated public transport/vehicular priority measures. The report also outlined proposals to ask the GCP Executive Board to delegate to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chairperson, a submission to Government for the inclusion of Girton Interchange and M11 smart motorway in the Highways England's second Roads Investment Strategy (RIS2).

The Joint Assembly discussed the report and made the following points:-

- Councillor John Williams was concerned that the GCP was taking a piecemeal, rather than strategic, approach to its development of P&R schemes and felt that they needed to be considered in the round and taking account of the interactions between the sites and the CAM metro proposals. He also commented that the Mayor did not appear to be supportive of P&R and sought an assurance that such proposals would be aligned to the CAM metro plans and would be a feature of the

Local Transport Plan.

- Councillor Grenville Chamberlain commented on the need to give more weight to supporting the development of the Girton interchange, noting that the many of the traffic problems in the west of Cambridge and on the A428 were caused by inability of traffic heading to the M11 to join directly and having to go down Madingley Hill. He understood that the MP for South Cambridgeshire had been supporting the development of interim proposals to address capacity issues.
- Andy Williams was of the view that the smart motorway option would not make a difference in terms of sustainable transport. He also commented on the need to understand how the CAM metro proposal would integrate with other public transport plans. With regard to potential take up of P&R, he did not believe that commuters would not use P&R facilities, but had been put off using the current facilities by the parking charge and lack of capacity at the Trumpington site. There did appear to be a demand for P&R capacity at Hauxton and Whittlesford.
- Councillor Dave Baigent stated that the views expressed by the Mayor to the Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee suggested that he was not supportive of P&R options.
- Councillor Tim Bick also believed that the Western Orbital would not constitute a sustainable transport solution. Use of the hard shoulder as an additional lane on the M11 motorway could not, in his view, be regarded as more than an interim solution. He was interested to know how the Western Orbital would connect with CAM metro as it was not clear from the plans circulated. It was also not clear how the P&R site would be accessed from the M11 and where any bus only links across the M11 would be located. Councillor Bick therefore questioned whether the proposal was sufficiently developed for the purpose of public consultation.
- Councillor Bridget Smith welcomed the proposals to improve the Girton interchange. With reference to the smart motorway proposal, she commented on the compelling case in terms of achieving significant accident reduction. Speaking on the P&R proposals, she read out a statement from the local ward councillor who was concerned at the impact of the scheme and was anxious that any intervention should not increase the A10 traffic through Harston and to the M11 junction and ideally should reduce it and considered that the impact of the proposals should be analysed against collected data on traffic flow before public consultation; that the option of prohibiting vehicle access or egress on to the A10 from the new P&R should be assessed; that the minimum size of the P&R should be constructed initially until demand was proven (such an approach was believed to be consistent with the development of temporary transport hubs); that other means of mitigating Harston traffic should be investigated along with dualling of the A505; and that improvements at Foxton station and development of a cycle park should be pursued to encourage use of the Cambridge stations. Councillor Smith argued that more work on Foxton capacity should be undertaken alongside the work on the P&R site because it might be possible to promote other options to increase the effectiveness of the P&R site and to reduce the size required. She indicated that she would have liked more certainty on some of the proposals, together with additional evidence and information.
- Christopher Walkinshaw welcomed the proposals but felt that the report did not demonstrate how the plans would help to address the significant capacity issues to 2031. The report noted that 200,000 additional jobs were planned just in the west and to the south of Cambridge but did not quantify the scale of the P&R scheme at Junction 11 needed to deal with the anticipated capacity issues.
- Councillor Kevin Cuffley was concerned at the potential for additional traffic through Harston and Hauxton and agreed that there was a need for the Foxton level crossing bypass and travel hub and station improvements to be looked at alongside this with the aim of promoting modal shift and reducing traffic. He had

reservations about the smart motorway proposal as he was concerned it had the potential to create more vehicular traffic.

- Dr John Wells was supportive of the proposals for Girton Interchange and concurred that the smart motorway would provide some temporary additional capacity and safety advantages. However he emphasised the importance of being clear on how the P&R strategy would integrate with other public transport plans. The creation of additional capacity on the M11 would be of little value if the proposals did not address bottlenecks at junctions. There was a need to either improve junctions and/or achieve modal shift. He also pointed out that the report did not address proposals to manage traffic at the biomedical campus. The P&R proposals were conceptual but there was no clear indication in the report of the number of spaces proposed at the facility and how it would connect with other transport links to transit into the city. Dr Wells felt that it was perhaps rather premature to go to public consultation on the scheme as, in his view, there remained a number of disconnected elements.
- With reference to paragraph 3.8 of the report, Councillor Tim Bick noted the indication given that more detail about bus priority interventions along Trumpington Road would be provided in the consultation and would include input from the engagement group. He asked whether the Joint Assembly would have the opportunity to see the further detail before it went to public consultation and commented that previously the intention had been that the Joint Assembly would see proposals before they were put out to public consultation so that there was an opportunity for the Joint Assembly to balance feedback from residents/engagement groups against strategic aims. He was therefore concerned that the Joint Assembly might not have another opportunity to review proposals before they went to consultation and felt that there was too low a level of detail in the current proposals upon which to consult.
- Councillor Dave Baigent commented that the new P&R site at J11 was needed to provide for the additional demand from the biomedical campus and to contribute towards delivering the strategic aim of reducing traffic in the city.
- Helen Valentine sought further explanation about the proposed interventions along Trumpington Road which she felt were unclear from the maps provided. She noted that there were problems with both access and egress, particularly in the vicinity of the Waitrose junction which was very congested, and felt that bus priority improvements alone would not address the problem.

In response to questions raised above, the Director of Transport:

- Indicated that he did not consider that a piecemeal approach was being taken to the delivery of P&R schemes and that there was a recognition of the need to provide a range of transport interchange options, not solely focusing on arrival by car. However he did take on board the Joint Assembly's concerns at the need more clearly to articulate the P&R strategy and to provide more information about the proposed size and capacity of the P&R facility.
- Advised that the CAM metro proposal considered by the Combined Authority had expressly provided for P&R sites and that a key component of the CAM network was a recognition of the need for access points.
- Acknowledged that the smart motorway proposal was an interim solution, but noted that it would create additional capacity and achieve junction improvements.
- Noted that the report referred to increasing capacity at the Trumpington Road site by 299 spaces to address short term capacity constraints associated with the expansion of the biomedical campus.
- Agreed that there was a need to align consideration of this scheme alongside the proposals relating to the Foxton level crossing and travel hub.

- Confirmed that traffic modelling would be undertaken and would take account of anticipated future growth.
- Acknowledged the potential need for discussion with the Combined Authority on prohibition of access to or from the P&R site onto the A10.
- Advised that the detailed proposals had not been produced for Trumpington Road. It had not been intended to bring the proposals back to the Joint Assembly but he would reflect on the comments made.
- Commented that the Foxton and M11 schemes would serve different markets and there was a need to communicate this in a more coherent way.

The Chief Executive indicated that she would circulate information to the Joint Assembly about work the GCP had undertaken with Highways England on whether some of the initial improvements at Girton interchange could be delivered in a quicker timeframe whilst the highway improvement work was on-going. Officers were continuing to lobby to seek the inclusion of the Girton Interchange in RIS2

The Joint Assembly noted the proposals to be submitted to the GCP Executive Board, with their views and concerns, as above, to be incorporated into the Chairperson's report to the Board. Key elements of feedback to the Board included:-

- The positive challenge around the need more clearly to articulate the P&R strategy and how it linked to the CAM metro proposal and other public transport schemes.
- The need for a greater level of detail around the proposals prior to public consultation, including on the proposals for Trumpington Road.
- The Joint Assembly's support for continuing to lobby Highways England regarding the smart motorway proposal in view of the scope to improve resilience, safety and junction performance, whilst acknowledging that this was only an interim solution.
- The Joint Assembly's welcome for the proposals to seek to increase capacity at the Girton Interchange to address current traffic congestion issues and contribute to the delivery of improved public transport services and its support for officers continuing to work with Highways England to develop the case for inclusion of Girton Interchange in RIS2.

9. CITY ACCESS UPDATE INCLUDING MODE SHIFT AND DEMAND MANAGEMENT OPTIONS

The Director of Transport introduced a report which invited the Joint Assembly to comment on the progress to date of the City Access programme and to provide views on the options for achieving modal shift through demand management. In so doing, the Director first gave a short presentation, highlighting, in particular, current mode split and air quality.

The Joint Assembly discussed the report and comments, including the following, were made:-

- Councillor Noel Kavanagh highlighted the public health impact of air pollution and advocated the investigation of air pollution exclusion zones outside schools as part of the package of measures. He noted that a YouGov survey indicated that 60% of parents had indicated support for introduction of such an exclusion zone. Additionally he commented on the impact of the peak time "school run" on all routes.
- Councillor Grenville Chamberlain referred to an FIA study on demand management and highlighted a number of relevant points including the need:-
 - to explore all other options for improving mobility before considering road charging;

- to understand the rationale and scope of a charging scheme;
- to estimate the impact on a range of scenarios, including congestion, accidents, energy consumption, carbon footprint, air quality and modal split;
- to target options for income redistribution and to make maximum use of technology available; and
- To undertake a market oriented, rather than politically driven, approach to designing the scheme.

He felt that the charging would only be publicly acceptable if it was seen to deliver a solution to a problem. Demand management measures needed to be equitable to all users and provide safe, secure and reliable alternatives which got people to their destinations rapidly, but public transport had to be affordable and assist a reduction in pollution. The scope for introducing restrictions on older, more polluting, vehicles entering the city could be considered as part of any demand management measures.

- Dr John Wells noted that there was no reference in the report to P&R and felt that it should be considered as part of access management design since P&R provided the interchange point for longer commutes. Additionally, he highlighted the need to put attractive transport alternatives in place before any charges were introduced. He noted that the estimated costs of service enhancements outlined in paragraph 6.14 was £20m per annum, however a report later in the agenda seemed to suggest that the income from the demand management aspect of the city access project would not be generated until 2020. Given that there did not appear to be any funding provision made to subsidise public transport improvements in the interim, Dr Wells sought clarification regarding the budgetary position.
- Helen Valentine observed that there was only a passing reference to the Workplace Parking Levy in the report and questioned whether this potential initiative had been dropped. She also commented that the lack of cycle parking was a key constraint in promoting cycling and suggested that it might be appropriate to commission research on cycle parking.
- Councillor John Williams referred to the opportunities presented by the Bus Services Act which had not been referred to in the report. He agreed that public transport improvements needed to be made before any demand management measures were introduced and suggested that the Combined Authority could perhaps borrow the necessary funding to invest in the enhancement of services. This could then be repaid from the subsequent income from the demand management measures.
- Councillor Kevin Cuffley indicated that there was the potential for the public to regard some of the demand management measures highlighted, such as workplace parking levy, pollution charging and intelligent charging, as a congestion charge. He reminded the Joint Assembly of the policy position of South Cambridgeshire District Council, which, on 26 January 2017, had passed a motion recording its opposition to the principle of a congestion charging scheme as it would penalise residents of South Cambridgeshire who had no realistic alternative to the car in travelling into Cambridge for work.
- Andy Williams noted that the issue of demand management had been subject of discussion for a considerable time and acknowledged that there was a divergence of views. He asked what support businesses could provide to ensure that officers felt able to present the optimum technical solutions from a professional perspective which could then be debated by the politicians. From a business perspective he recognised that there was a need for a decision to be made. With reference to paragraph 6.21, he questioned whether revenue generating ability should be regarded as a critical success factor.
- Christopher Walkinshaw commented on the need to have regard to the traffic that

used the city as a thoroughfare. Additionally, noting that 44,000 new jobs were forecast by 2031, it would be important that people coming into the city had the option of accessing public transport not just from the nearest point to them but also the shortest route for their journey.

- Councillor Dave Baigent noted the projected significant further increase in businesses, industry and commerce locating to Cambridge and that this would result in a further associated increase in traffic. One of the restrictions to this potential growth would be the lack of infrastructure for public transport. It was important therefore that there were appropriate transport hubs on the periphery of the city which enabled people to complete their journeys on public transport. Responding to the comments regarding the potential burden on South Cambridgeshire residents, he argued that if there was an attractive partially subsidised public transport alternative, there should not be additional cost burdens and commuters would benefit from shorter journeys. He believed that demand management would need to be the “stick” but that it was important that the “carrot” was in place first. He stressed that in order to sustain the anticipated growth in businesses, appropriate measures to control cars, including electric cars, coming into the city centre were essential.
- Councillor Bridget Smith welcomed the report but suggested that the next iteration should include ambitious targets in respect of the proposed measures set out in paragraph 3.2. She commented that consideration should also be given to controlling tourist buses in the city centre and to taking an innovative approach to school transport. Whilst managing transport was a key concern, Councillor Smith felt that improving air quality was the priority in terms of improving public health outcomes. She hoped that the Joint Assembly would receive the next iteration of the report in a timely manner.
- Councillor Tim Bick welcomed a good report but regretted that it had not been possible to bring it forward earlier in the life of the GCP. He observed that a range of measures were being considered and noted that the proposals were now underpinned by evidence from “Our Big Conversation”. It was important that “carrots” and “sticks” were not looked at separately but as part of an integrated approach to tackle congestion and improve air quality. Councillor Bick sought further clarification on the suggestion in the paper that there was a need for a blend of measures to ensure that the GCP realised its objectives in the most optimal way. He also noted that it appeared from the report that consultation would take place during the summer and recommended that such an important consultation should not take place during the summer holidays.
- Councillor Ian Bates, the Transport Portfolio, commented that all parts of the “jigsaw” needed to fit together.

In response to the comments expressed about the time taken to bring forward the report, the Chairperson reminded the Joint Assembly of the significant changes that had occurred with the GCP, noting in particular, that the GCP now had the benefit of its own professional and technical officer support.

Responding to Members’ questions, the Director of Transport:-

- Acknowledged the need to understand the benefits of the various demand management measures and what each required in transport terms. He agreed that P&R would be part of the strategy.
- Confirmed that the Workplace Parking Levy was still being considered as part of the measures and more work on cycle parking was planned.
- Explained the budgetary position, noting in particular that the GCP had not yet made a policy decision to proceed with the demand management initiative. He

cited the example of London where bus services had been enhanced prior to the introduction of the congestion charge and the income had then been used to offset the costs of the public transport improvements.

- Confirmed that the proposal relating to air pollution exclusion zones could be looked at as part of the package of proposals to be reviewed. GCP officers were already working with the City Council on developing clean air zones. It would be important to understand the options available and the impact of introducing such measures from the Cambridge perspective and to develop appropriate evidence based conclusions.
- Advised that the bus survey review would be undertaken by the Combined Authority this year.
- Indicated that adopting a blended and holistic approach to the different types of demand measures would help to ensure that the measures were effective and equitable, taking account of the impact on the locality and on different stakeholder groups.
- Confirmed that the consultation would not take place during the summer holidays.

Referring to the question on how businesses could support officers in progressing the initiative, the Chief Executive indicated that officers would seek to bring forward the evidence in a measured way for review and determination. She further commented that revenue raising had not been identified as a critical success factor as that might suggest pre-determination, instead it was appropriate to bring forward the evidence to enable the right solution to be determined. Referring to “Our Big Conversation”, the Chief Executive observed that the qualitative evidence was now available to the GCP, but the next step would be to look at the technical evidence.

Subject to the comments and concerns as outlined above, the Joint Assembly indicated general support for further work to be progressed on the City Access programme, with their views to be incorporated into the Chairperson’s report to the Executive Board.

10. QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT, INCLUDING BUDGET SETTING 2018/2019

The Joint Assembly received and noted the Quarterly Progress Report, including Budget Setting for 2018/19.

In introducing the report, the Strategic Programme and Commissioning Manager drew particular attention to:-

- (a) The GCP Budget Setting report, as set out in Appendix 1; and
- (b) The update provided on the Independent Economic Assessment Panel, as set out in Appendix 2.

During discussion on the report:-

- Councillor Tim Bick referred to his understanding that the Housing Development Agency (HDA) was currently only executing housing development schemes on behalf of one of the three partners within the Greater Cambridge Partnership, rather than all three partners as originally intended. He commented that the GCP had previously agreed to provide funding to the HDA and indicated that he would welcome submission of a report on the operation of the HDA to the Joint Assembly.
- Councillor John Williams spoke on affordable housing and highlighted research which indicated that over a third of households in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire had less than £30k per annum gross income and could only afford

a 1 bedroom property in the private rental market. He noted that no breakdown was given in the report of the types of homes being provided; the extent to which these were affordable social homes and how the new build programme was addressing housing needs in the area.

- Councillor Bridget Smith:-
 - commented on the strong performance in respect of apprenticeships in Greater Cambridge, bucking national trends, but noted that the skills working group felt it was important to look at other skills work and asked whether there would be an opportunity to review the budget for skills. The Sanger Institute had highlighted the need to address the skills gap in the area, which was expected to increase owing to the impact of Brexit, and Councillor Smith felt that the GCP, working with the LEP, could make a contribution to addressing the skills gap and to generating the workforce locally;
 - requested that the Joint Assembly receive an update on the "Smart Places" workstream; and
 - asked for an explanation of the significant increase in the costs relating to the Independent Economic Assessment Panel.
- Councillor Noel Kavanagh was pleased to note the good progress achieved by the cycling project team and commended them on their performance.

Responding to the points raised in discussion, the Strategic Programme and Commissioning Manager:-

- Agreed to bring a report on the current position with the HDA to the Joint Assembly. In so doing, she noted that the GCP had provided seed funding of £200k to support the start up of the HDA, the last payment of which had just been released.
- Indicated that future reports on delivery of affordable homes would include a breakdown of types of homes completed and tenure.
- Explained the current position with the skills budget, particularly in respect of work on apprenticeships, but noted that there should be an opportunity for the working group to work up a case for inclusion of additional funding in the Future Investment Strategy (FIS) in respect of GCP's wider activity on skills.
- Confirmed that an update would be submitted to the Joint Assembly on "Smart Places" in the next progress report as part of a planned six monthly update.
- With respect to the Independent Economic Assessment Panel update, noted that in July 2017 phases 1b (co-production of local evaluation frameworks) and 1c (development of outline evaluation plan) had not been sufficiently progressed to be able accurately to estimate the costs. Officers had worked to reduce the costs and would continue to liaise with the consultants and the Government to ensure the evaluation process progressed to time and budget.

The Chief Executive outlined various activities going on in the "Smart Places" workstream and indicated that more information on this would be shared with the Joint Assembly in the next progress report.

With reference to the budget for 2018/19 at Appendix 1, the Joint Assembly's attention was particularly drawn to:-

- Additional funding requested for cross city cycling and for Chisholm Trail cycle links; and
- Paragraph 6 of the report which highlighted a budget shortfall which would be funded from a first call on the next phase of City Deal grant funding. Given that the

majority of the scheme expenditure occurred in later years, this reduced the financial risk and it was therefore considered appropriate to develop Tranche 1 on the assumption of the release of future funding. If grant funding was not released, schemes would need to be reprioritised.

With reference to paragraph 6, Councillor John Williams asked why the Joint Assembly did not see the GCP's risk register. The Chief Executive confirmed that there was a project risk register and that this could be included in future progress reports.

Helen Valentine reflected that previously less firm assumptions appeared to have been made about receipt of future grant funding. In response, the Strategic Programme and Commissioning Manager acknowledged that there was no guarantee of future funding but noted that officers worked closely with the relevant consultants and Government; had a good understanding of the benefits the Government expected the GCP to achieve and that there was reason to expect that the GCP would continue to be regarded as a safe investment.

The Joint Assembly broadly supported the proposals to be submitted to the GCP Executive Board, with their views to be incorporated into the Chairperson's report to the Board.

11. GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP FUTURE INVESTMENT STRATEGY

The Joint Assembly received a report setting out the draft Future Investment Strategy (FIS), together with the focus and rationale for the projects and schemes that were at its core.

In introducing the report, the Chief Executive:-

- Noted the importance of the FIS in demonstrating to Government that the GCP's future investment plans were robust and evidence based and gave Government the confidence and evidence needed to release further tranches of grant funding.
- Commented that the report reflected the work undertaken by Portfolio Holder Working Groups over the last six months to review how the FIS could address the challenges posed by an expanding population; fast growing economy and lack of affordable housing.
- Acknowledged that, to date, the GCP had primarily focused on investment for transport infrastructure, but indicated that there was now an opportunity to rebalance the GCP's investment focus by supporting the further growth of the economy and acceleration of housing delivery.
- Indicated that, when considering how best resources could be used to achieve the strategic aims of the GCP, the FIS could act as a catalyst for the GCP to use its resources more flexibly.
- Drew particular attention to paragraph 8 of the report which set out initial thinking around the process for FIS prioritisation and noted that officers would report back at the next meeting on progress with developing criteria to prioritise schemes and projects.
- Sought the Joint Assembly's views on whether the consultation on the FIS should be linked to a further conversation on the demand management options process, with a view to providing a link between the FIS and the potential to raise additional investment to fund public transport.

During discussion on the report:-

- Councillor John Williams pointed out that Newmarket Road was missing from the diagram at Annex 2 to the report. In response, it was noted that it was included on the most recent version of the diagram.
- Councillor Tim Bick was not supportive of combining consultation on the FIS with that on Demand Management options. He felt that, in view of the uniqueness and importance of the project, the demand management options should be subject of a separate consultation.
- Councillor Bridget Smith noted that paragraph 18.3 suggested an option for a “light touch online approach” to consultation on the FIS and referred to difficulties which had arisen on previous projects where the level of consultation had not been adequate. She believed that there should be an appropriate level of engagement in respect of the FIS and cautioned against taking a “light touch” approach.

The Chief Executive thanked the Joint Assembly for their comments which she would take on board.

The Joint Assembly generally supported the proposals in the report to be submitted to the Executive Board, with their views to be incorporated into the Chairperson’s report to the Board.

12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Joint Assembly noted that the next meeting will take place on Thursday 14 June 2018 at 2.00pm in the Guildhall, Cambridge.

The Meeting ended at 4.50 p.m.
