



Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board held on
Wednesday, 28 January 2015 at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board:

John Bridge	Cambridgeshire Chambers of Commerce
Councillor Steve Count	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Lewis Herbert	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Ray Manning	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Professor Jeremy Sanders	University of Cambridge

Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly and Executive Board substitutes in attendance:

Councillor Tim Bick	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Simon Edwards	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Claire Ruskin	Cambridge Network
Councillor Bridget Smith	South Cambridgeshire District Council

Officers/advisors:

Antoinette Jackson	Cambridge City Council
Andrew Limb	Cambridge City Council
Aaron Blowers	Cambridgeshire County Council
Graham Hughes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Dearbhla Lawson	Cambridgeshire County Council
Mark Lloyd	Cambridgeshire County Council
Chris Malyon	Cambridgeshire County Council
Alex Colyer	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Jean Hunter	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Graham Watts	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Neil Darwin	Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership
Greg Callaghan	Peter Brett Associates (representing the University of Cambridge)

CO-OPTION OF MEMBERS

The Executive Board **AGREED** to co-opt John Bridge (Chief Executive of the Cambridgeshire Chambers of Commerce) and Professor Jeremy Sanders (Pro-Vice Chancellor for Institutional Affairs at the University of Cambridge) onto the Board, with Mark Reeve (Chairman of the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership) being allocated as Mr Bridge's named substitute.

1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN

Councillor Lewis Herbert was **APPOINTED** as Chairman of the Executive Board.

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

Councillor Ray Manning was **APPOINTED** as Vice-Chairman of the Executive Board.

3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made at this stage of proceedings.

5. NOTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE CITY DEAL SHADOW BOARD

The notes of the meeting of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Shadow Board held on 10 December 2014 were **AGREED** as a correct record.

6. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Questions were asked and answered as follows:

Question by Antony Carpen

Mr Carpen asked:

“What conversations will the Executive be having with the Haverhill Rail Campaign and Suffolk and Essex County Councils regarding their highly advanced proposals to re-link Haverhill to Cambridge and further link it to Colchester and Chelmsford, making a possibility of direct rail services between two ARU campuses a possibility?”

Graham Hughes, Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, highlighted that one of the potential schemes around the A1307 involved linking towards Haverhill, as he had outlined at the meeting of the Joint Assembly on 12 January 2015, and all options along the corridor would be explored as part of the scheme. He added that this particular issue had been looked at over a number of years and some difficult practical issues to overcome had already been identified, but that discussions would continue to be held on this matter.

Question by Antony Carpen

Mr Carpen asked:

“I have not seen any publicity around explaining to people what this Board or the Assembly is – feedback on social media hasn’t been positive and has reflected lack of communications and democratic legitimacy. Any comments?”

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman, outlined that meetings of the Shadow Board had been held in public in the lead-up to this first meeting of the Executive Board which, together with meetings of the Joint Assembly, would also be held in the public domain.

It was also noted that a microsite was in the process of being developed for the Greater Cambridge City Deal and that this would be launched very shortly at www.greatercambridgecitydeal.co.uk

Councillor Steve Count, Leader of Cambridgeshire County Council, felt that the Executive Board and wider governance arrangements around the City Deal did have democratic

accountability embedded within them. He had been democratically elected as a Councillor, as the other Council representatives had been, who had subsequently been appointed onto the Board at meetings of Full Council by their respective authorities. He argued that it was not clear how much more democratically accountable the body could be expected to be.

Councillor Count was also disappointed that people had not picked up on information about the Greater Cambridge City Deal. A range of stakeholder events had been held, numerous press releases had been issued and articles had been included in Council magazines on the subject of the City Deal. He added, however, that more people should be encouraged to engage.

Question by Antony Carpen

Mr Carpen asked:

“Are the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board and Joint Assembly suitable for residents to hold Cambridge University and its member colleges accountable to the people of Cambridge and not just its members? What would Cambridge University’s decisions be like if within its core values it held itself responsible for all of the people of Cambridge and not just its members?”

Professor Jeremy Sanders, Pro-Vice Chancellor for Institutional Affairs at the University of Cambridge, outlined that the mission of the University was to contribute to society through the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence. He added that, in pursuing that mission, the University directly made major contributions to the economy, social fabric and culture of the Greater Cambridge area as well as attracting other vital employers and activities.

Professor Sanders highlighted, however, that the University was an independent, self-governing charity and was not democratically accountable through the City Deal Executive Board, which was why as the University’s representative on the Board he would be unable to vote on the Board’s spending decisions. The University’s nominees on the Joint Assembly represented three other important but distinct and independent constituencies in the local area. These were Anglia Ruskin University, Cambridge Regional College and the hospitals, who spoke for themselves and not necessarily for the University of Cambridge.

Question by Richard Taylor

Mr Taylor asked:

“What is the potential scope of the scheme described as: ‘on-line bus priority measures between the Milton Interchange and Mitcham’s Corner?’”

Mr Hughes explained that there was no particular scope for this project at this stage and it was only a concept. If the Executive Board agreed that this concept was an important scheme, further feasibility work would take place and the options relating to the scheme would be reported back for consideration to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board. Should the Board decide that none of the options were worth pursuing, the scheme would simply fall out of the prioritised programme.

Mr Taylor referred to the local Member of Parliament who was campaigning against cutting down trees on Milton Road to potentially make way for a dual-carriageway. Mr

Hughes outlined that there were no plans for a dual-carriageway. A scheme for the road had been proposed approximately 15 years ago, but the scheme included as part of the City Deal was not looking to re-visit that proposal. He emphasised that the scheme would seek to focus on the effective and efficient flow of public transport in and out of the city rather than providing more facilities for private car users.

The Chairman took this opportunity to emphasise that a full public consultation process would be held on all schemes going forward.

7. JOINT ASSEMBLY CO-OPTED MEMBERS

The Executive Board **RATIFIED** the Shadow Board's endorsement of the following co-options onto the Joint Assembly:

Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership

Sir Michael Marshall (Marshall Group)
Claire Ruskin (Cambridge Network)
Andy Williams (AstraZeneca)

University of Cambridge

Anne Constantine (Cambridge Regional College)
Jane Ramsey (Cambridge University Health Partners – Addenbrookes)
Helen Valentine (Anglia Ruskin University)

8. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE JOINT ASSEMBLY

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly, provided the Executive Board with a verbal report on the meeting of the Assembly held on 12 January 2015 and its recommendations to the Board. The draft minutes from that meeting were circulated, for information.

Councillor Bick reported that the main item considered by the Assembly was the 2015-20 prioritised infrastructure investment programme. The Assembly put forward the following amendments to the programme:

- (a) the removal of the Bourn Airfield / Cambourne busway scheme from the tranche 1 priority programme as a priority scheme, assuming that capital expenditure for delivery of this scheme did not occur in the first five years of the City Deal programme but that the technical evaluation work could still be undertaken on the full corridor;
- (b) the removal of the heading 'reserve schemes' so that the table included all schemes and did not refer to any as reserve schemes;
- (c) the estimated cost of the Foxton level crossing and interchange scheme being amended from £14 million to £0, to reflect that this would be funded by an external source and not from City Deal funding;
- (d) the amendment of the title of the A1307 bus priority / A1307 additional Park & Ride scheme to read "A1307 corridor to include bus priority / A1307 additional Park & Ride".

The programme, subject to these amendments, was recommended to the Board and had been reflected in table 1 of the covering report for item 9 at this meeting.

The Assembly also considered a report on the funding of City Deal non-project costs, and supported the recommendations contained within the report subject to the inclusion of a

£150,000 cap in respect of the delegated authority given to the Chief Finance Officer at the County Council. It was therefore recommended to the Executive Board that:

- (a) the pooled resources of the three local authorities be used to fund those specific items set out in section 6 of the report for 2015/16;
- (b) a more detailed budget for 2015/16 be considered by the Joint Assembly at its next meeting;
- (c) the three local authorities be requested to make initial budgetary provisions within their respective medium term financial strategies in line with the contents of the report;
- (d) the Chief Finance Officer of the County Council be given delegated responsibility to incur any essential expenditure pending the agreement of a detailed budget appertaining to the functions contained within the report, subject to a cap of £150,000;
- (e) the Executive Board is asked to consider additional opportunities for the use of pooled resources at a future meeting.

9. 2015-20 PRIORITISED INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT PROGRAMME

Consideration was given to a report which provided the Executive Board with an opportunity to agree priority schemes for the transport infrastructure investment programme for delivery from 2015/16 to 2019/20 as part of the Greater Cambridge City Deal.

Graham Hughes, Cambridgeshire County Council's Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment, delivered a presentation on the concept of the Greater Cambridge City Deal and the infrastructure investment programme. He highlighted that the Greater Cambridge area was a truly internationally competitive city and region, that it had unique characteristics known commonly as the 'Cambridge Phenomenon' and that it had a global scale concentration of high-tech industries but that future growth was threatened by congestion and housing.

The vision of the City Deal was noted as being to realise the economic potential of the area, to unleash the next wave of the 'Cambridge Phenomenon', to improve connectivity and enhance reliability of journeys.

The infrastructure investment programme had been drawn from Local Plans and the Transport Strategy and City Deal funding would be delivered in three tranches over 15 to 20 years. In terms of the first five years of investment, the focus would be on maximising network benefits, maximising economic benefits and deliverability.

It was noted that the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly considered the schemes on 12 January 2015 and broadly accepted the recommendations for the prioritisation methodology and high priority schemes, as reported by the Chairman of the Assembly at this meeting in the previous item.

The process for assessing the prioritisation of schemes consisted of a high level economic analysis of schemes that had been undertaken to identify relative economic benefits and deliverability. The recommended programme drew together results of assessments to help inform a robust and deliverable programme to 2020 to achieve the aims of the City Deal. Taking into account the amendments put forward by the Joint Assembly, table 1 of the report set out a list of schemes totalling £260.59 million.

Mr Hughes confirmed the process for scheme development that would be followed going forward. Schemes would be developed via an iterative process with significant

consultation, including a baseline survey, data gathering and options development, an options report and outline business case, a decision on the preferred option to develop, full business case development, a decision to deliver a scheme, statutory processes as applicable and construction. A shorter process for smaller schemes was likely to be introduced.

The need to develop schemes for later stages of the City Deal was emphasised. Technical work for schemes in years six to fifteen could run alongside the development of schemes in years one to five.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman, invited Members of the Board to consider the recommendations of the Joint Assembly. The Board supported the recommendations but felt that the priority list of schemes was too large at £260.59 million when only £100 million was available for the first five years of the Deal. It was acknowledged, however, that allocating schemes in excess of £100 million would be sensible in order that there were contingencies should some of the schemes be removed from the programme following the feasibility work. Members of the Board discussed the list of prioritised schemes and made the following points:

- the final list of schemes should not be set hierarchically as all schemes in the programme should have equal standing as priority schemes. Listing them in a specific order with priority numbers may be misleading;
- it was important that a pipeline of schemes was available for taking forward subsequent to years one to five of the Deal. The Board had to plan for the longer term and be confident that trigger points would be met to ensure the further tranches of City Deal funding from the Government;
- the priority list should focus on those big projects that would make a significant difference and long length cycle paths outside of the city did not necessarily reflect that approach;
- long length cycle routes were made up of various segments, from village to village for example. Each segment could deliver benefits in their own right, so a different approach to consider could be the development of individual segments of cycle routes rather than committing to deliver a long length cycle route as a single scheme;
- the priority programme should include city centre cycling and bus routes as priorities to alleviate the significant problems that currently existed there. Other cycling schemes based outside of the city centre should be included as longer term programme items;
- the key problem in relation to employment and economic growth was infrastructure. When looking at priorities, the focus should be on corridors to ensure that people were able to easily travel to and from places of work. This approach would support existing businesses and employers, as well as attract new businesses to the area;
- residents of and people working in South Cambridgeshire also had a significant interest in the priority schemes included in the City Deal programme, so some of the schemes needed to reflect that;
- the introduction of additional Park and Ride facilities could go a long way to address the congestion problems in Cambridge. More cycle ways would not make a significant difference to the number of private cars going in and out of the city in the same way that further Park and Ride facilities would;
- priority should be given to those routes that could free up buses and get the traffic in the city moving;
- there were priority schemes for cyclists that would result in lots of people transferring from their private cars to bicycles, such as the Chisholm Trail for

example;

- the project for Hills Road in Cambridge would need to unlock buses and movement from the railway station;
- the city centre scheme was at the heart of the City Deal. Some of the changes required would be substantial but significant to the way in which the city worked;
- an item on the City Deal's extended programme, to include continuous pipeline schemes, would be considered by the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in due course.

The Chairman invited Members to consider which schemes to include as part of the 2015-20 prioritised infrastructure investment programme. The Executive Board unanimously **APPROVED** the programme, made up of the following schemes totalling £180.52 million:

- Milton Road bus priority
- Madingley Road bus priority
- Histon Road bus priority
- A428 to M11 segregated bus route / A428 corridor Park and Ride
- City centre capacity improvements / cross-city cycle improvements (to include Hills Road in the scope)
- A1307 corridor to include bus priority / A1307 additional Park and Ride
- Chisholm Trail cycle links / Chisholm Trail bridge
- Year 1 to 5 pipeline development
- Year 6 to 10 programme development
- Programme management and early scheme development

10. FUNDING OF CITY DEAL NON-PROJECT COSTS

The Executive Board considered a report which sought agreement, in principle, to the pooling of local authority resources in order to provide the necessary resources to support the delivery of the programme that could not be capitalised through individual projects.

Chris Malyon, Cambridgeshire County Council's Chief Finance Officer, presented the report and referred the Board to the table in the report which set out the current projections of receipts that would derive from New Homes Bonus funding from the three partner Councils and could be made available for pooling purposes. It was emphasised that the allocation of these sums would be subject to the ratification of the respective Councils during their forthcoming budget deliberations and approvals.

At this stage, the following costs had been identified as non-project relating activity that would require funding to ensure the successful delivery of the City Deal programme:

- central coordination;
- strategic communications;
- economic assessments/triggers.

It was reported that the detailed resource requirements for the above functions had not been fully evaluated, but a detailed set of budget proposals would be developed and set out in a future report to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board. An initial budget would be available for reporting to the next meeting of the Assembly.

Other non-project costs that were already being, and would continue to be, absorbed by the three partner Councils were noted as follows:

- democratic governance;
- legal and audit services;

- financial services;
- programme leadership.

It was noted that the Joint Assembly had recommended that a cap of £150,000 should be put in place on any essential non-project relating expenditure incurred with regard to the delegated authority given to the County Council's Chief Finance Officer.

The Executive Board:

- AGREED** that the pooled New Homes Bonus resource, as set out in the report, be used to fund the non-project costs required to support the successful delivery of the City Deal programme.
- NOTED** that funding from this source was a commitment for 2015/16 only and that any further funding would be subject to a formal budget statement presented to the Board prior to the start of each financial year.
- AGREED** that a detailed budget for 2015/16 would be considered by the Executive Board at the next meeting.
- AGREED** that the three local authorities be requested to make initial budgetary provisions within their respective Medium Term Financial Strategies in line with the contents of the report, subject to the on-going availability of New Homes Bonus to the levels set out in the report.
- AGREED** that the Chief Finance Officer of the County Council be given delegated responsibility to incur any essential expenditure pending the agreement of a detailed budget appertaining to the functions contained in the report, subject to a cap of £150,000 for the financial year.
- AGREED** to consider additional opportunities for the use of pooled resources at a future meeting.

11. WORK PROGRAMME

The Executive Board **AGREED** the below schedule of meetings:

- Friday 27 March 2015, 2pm
- Wednesday 17 June 2015, 2pm
- Tuesday 4 August 2015, 2pm
- Wednesday 9 September 2015, 2pm
- Thursday 1 October 2015, 2pm
- Tuesday 3 November 2015, 2pm
- Thursday 3 December 2015, 2pm

The Meeting ended at 3.40 p.m.
