



GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL JOINT ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly held on
Friday, 6 March 2015 at 10.00 a.m.

Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly:

Councillor Tim Bick	Cambridge City Council (Chairman)
Councillor Tim Wotherspoon	South Cambridgeshire District Council (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Kevin Price	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Martin Smart	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Roger Hickford	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Noel Kavanagh	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Francis Burkitt	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Bridget Smith	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Claire Ruskin	Cambridge Network
Andy Williams	AstraZeneca
Anne Constantine	Cambridge Regional College
Helen Valentine	Anglia Ruskin University

Members and substitutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board:

Councillor Lewis Herbert	Cambridge City Council
Professor Jeremy Sanders	University of Cambridge

Officers/advisors:

Andrew Limb	Cambridge City Council
Liz Bisset	Cambridge City Council
Aaron Blowers	Cambridgeshire County Council
Graham Hughes	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

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Maurice Leeke (Cambridgeshire County Council), Sir Michael Marshall (Marshall Group) and Jane Ramsey (Cambridge University Hospitals).

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 12 January 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Claire Ruskin declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 18(a) with regard to inward investment and her role as Chief Executive of the Cambridge Network.

4. QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

The following questions were asked, the answers to which the Chairman felt would be provided as part of debating item 7(c) at this meeting:

Question by Jim Chisholm

Mr Chisholm made the following points in presenting his question:

- on 2 March 2015 an Office of the Duty Prime Minister press release cited research showing that if this country had levels of cycling similar to Denmark it could save the NHS £17 billion within 20 years, reduce road deaths by 30%, increase mobility of the nation's poorest families by 25% and increase retail sales by a quarter;
- travel for Cambridgeshire surveys showed that the average length of cycle commutes was nearly six kilometres;
- the 2011 census stated that 10% of commuting trips in South Cambridgeshire were by cycle, with 2,400 over 5 kilometres and 650 more than 10 kilometres;
- cycle trips across the boundary from South Cambridgeshire to the city had increased by 89% in the last nine years, whereas numbers of car trips were relatively stable;
- over half the benefits of new cycle schemes under Cycle Ambitions Grants were from improved health, which had big economic benefits;
- 36% of households in the lowest quintile income group in East Anglia had no access to a van or car.

Mr Chisholm asked what the Joint Assembly, and the general public, could do to ensure that the Board was better aware of this and similar information.

Question by Gareth Bevans

Mr Bevans asked whether the Joint Assembly could include the following legacy, financial and social impacts as part of its consideration of longer distance foot and cycle paths in the Greater Cambridge area:

- the social and health benefits of providing safe access to the countryside for city dwellers as well as those living along these corridors;
- the enhanced social wellbeing created by enabling and encouraging families and friends of all ages who were dispersed along these corridors to affordably, safely and routinely use these paths to interact with each other;
- the opportunity cost of inactivity on an individual's personal health, and the associated savings to health services should road users be given a walking or cycling alternative;
- the economic and strategic benefits of completing the links between the Research Parks south of the City at Hinxton, Little Chesterford, Great Abington, Babraham and Addenbrooke's, and also of linking them to the residential areas south of the city;
- increased opportunities for tourists to extend their stay in Cambridge and explore and experience the surrounding countryside, towns, villages and attractions;
- present and future road congestion, particularly given the housing planned for Uttlesford and settlements to the South of Cambridge;
- the pay back period achieved on the road maintenance budget of road users who had switched transport modes to cycling and walking.

Question by Susan van de Ven

Susan van de Ven spoke as the County Councillor for Melbourn, Foxton, Shepreth and Meldreth, which made up a large chunk of the Cambridge to Royston corridor and part of an intensely interconnected cluster of employment centres and residential areas. Royston was across the county border but was still part of the Local Enterprise Partnership and was integral to the Greater Cambridge phenomenon that existed along the A10, both on account of its housing building plans and also its industrial park and multiple employment opportunities.

Councillor van de Ven also chaired the A10 Corridor Cycling Campaign, whose members lived between Royston and Cambridge and worked at places such as Melbourn Science Park, Johnson Matthey and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. The Cycling Campaign presented the Joint Assembly with a letter of support that had been signed by 66 employment centres in the A10 Corridor. It emphasised the high value placed on the prospect of a safe cycling network along the A10, as a means of travelling to work. She added that distances were modest and achievable, business car park spaces were running out and congestion rendered car journey times at peak hours unreliable.

Councillor van de Ven said that the City Deal was built around the principle of unlocking further funding, and so the announcement on 2 March 2015 of Cycling Ambition Grant funding was a case in point. Subject to agreement by a County Council Committee next week, Councillor van de Ven reported that this would help fund a cycle route between Cambridge and Foxton. The unfunded half of the Cambridge to Royston cycle link was the southern half from Foxton Level Crossing to Royston. This was a highly deliverable segment of the overall scheme, with land ownership issues resolved, path design completed and local consultation on details carried out. The A10 Campaign had facilitated regular interaction with Council colleagues in Hertfordshire and it had also been talking to the Local Enterprise Partnerships.

Councillor van de Ven closed by saying that, while it was disappointing that none of the rural cycle schemes were included in the Executive Board's tranche one priority list, the job now was to find ways of supporting their progression and realisation.

5. PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

6. PUBLIC TRANSPORT IN GREATER CAMBRIDGE

Andy Campbell, Managing Director of Stagecoach East, provided the Joint Assembly with brief presentation on his perception of the congestion problems in the Greater Cambridge area.

He commenced by stating that Cambridgeshire County Council had a proven track record of implementing effective transport solutions and cited the introduction of the five Park and Ride sites with bus lanes either into or out of the city as an example. Car traffic had been held to manageable levels with the various phases of the core scheme, although each of these phases had proved successful by reducing traffic flows in the city centre itself which improved the environment and safety of Emmanuel Street. A consequence of that success, however, was that more traffic currently flowed on the roads surrounding the core schemes.

The Busway and Park and Ride projects had both required additional vehicles to cope with demand, which accounted for seven million passenger journeys a year. As a result of this proactive approach to public transport, Mr Campbell reported that Cambridge had seen significantly higher levels of investment by Stagecoach. However, he also highlighted that some more recent projects had resulted in increased traffic congestion and made bus operation more difficult. These included 20mph speed limits on some bus routes, the reduction of traffic lanes on Hills Road Bridge, additional traffic lights following the rail station development and the Catholic Church junction alteration which reduced the time given to motor vehicles and increased junction blocking following the removal of the yellow box. Further reductions to the road space were also planned on Hills Road and Huntingdon Road with the floating bus stop scheme.

Mr Campbell fully supported the segregation of cyclists to encourage more people to cycle more safely in Cambridge, but he felt strongly that this should not be done at the expense of traffic flows throughout the city.

Referring to the parking charges at Park and Ride facilities, Mr Campbell saw this as a reverse congestion charge which penalised those motorists actually reducing congestion whilst making travel into the city free to those motorists who caused it. He was therefore of the opinion that those motorists helping to reduce congestion by using the Park and Ride services should not be charged to park their vehicles. He added that the future expansion of Cambridge had to be linked to an effective transport system that managed traffic flows but did not bar motorists from the city centre.

Mr Campbell was supportive of the proposal for the improvements to the main arterial routes, although he accepted that some would be more difficult than others to achieve. For a number of years he had requested green routes for Cambridge that were enforced, similar to the red routes in London.

He closed by saying that, in his view, the most effective project that would deliver an instant improvement was Hills Road from the city centre to Addenbrooke's hospital. He did, however, appreciate that this would be politically difficult but warned that if this section could not be achieved then the other schemes would not deliver the solution to Cambridge's transport problems.

The Chairman invited Members of the Joint Assembly to ask questions.

Councillor Burkitt asked Mr Campbell to expand on his point of view regarding the link between Hills Road and Addenbrooke's hospital being the most important project to aid city centre congestion. Mr Campbell reflected on the need to deliver quick results to achieve further funding in tranches two and three of the City Deal. He felt that developing the arterial routes would do nothing to assist the congestion problems in the centre of the city and stated that the biggest hotspots in Cambridge were the city centre station and Addenbrooke's hospital. This was also where people drove through the city as there was no reliable alternative for them to use in order to get around Cambridge. Mr Campbell felt that without doing something radical this situation would not be avoided.

Councillor Noel Kavanagh reflected on pollution in the city centre and stated that Cambridge had been identified as being one of the most populated parts of the United Kingdom. He was of the opinion that the bus fleet was still contributing to that and asked whether any of the £21 million to improve the fleet had gone towards investing into more environmentally friendly vehicles. Councillor Kavanagh also picked up the point about a radical solution and gave examples that could be introduced of limiting the number of vehicles, including buses, from entering the city centre and also pedestrianising the centre of Cambridge.

Mr Campbell highlighted that Stagecoach would be willing to keep investing and had held discussions with the City and County Councils on a range of proposals, which even included use of electric buses. Electric buses would pose some difficulties to the way in which services operated in the Greater Cambridge area. For example, the length of roads on some services meant that charging terminal points would need to be installed throughout the network and it would take 10 minutes to charge the vehicles when required. Mr Campbell stated that Stagecoach would be interested in entering into a business partnership agreement with the partners of the Greater Cambridge City Deal, whereby once an infrastructure was introduced that was delivering results, Stagecoach would invest in environmentally cleaner and more efficient buses. He reported that Stagecoach had experimented with different fuels and stated that 31 buses in the Greater Cambridge area were now running on bio fuel. 50 buses had also been renewed on city services and were fitted with the most efficient engines on the market at that time. In terms of reducing the number of buses in the city centre, Mr Campbell highlighted that Stagecoach made 20 million journeys a year based on demand. If the number of bus journeys into the city centre was limited, he was unsure how people who wanted to get into the city centre would be able to do so without adding to congestion by using their own vehicles.

Councillor Martin Smart was of the opinion that a modern and efficient bus service would sell products much better, especially in view of the 4 million tourists that visited Cambridge each year. He made reference to modern facilities, such as talking buses used in London for example, which told passengers where they were. He emphasised that cost, convenience and enjoyment were key factors for customers using a bus service.

Mr Campbell referred to the sightseeing buses for tourists, which were also used to try and attract people to Park and Ride sites. Discussions had been held with the City Council about what could be done to encourage people to stay in the city for longer periods of time. He also reported that work had been ongoing for two years to finalise talking buses on the Bus Way, with modern visual screens also due to be put in place. The University was also developing a mobile app to support the bus service, so work towards a modern service was already taking place.

Councillor Smart also made reference to the level of fumes at the bus station and asked what could be done to address that. He cited Southampton as an example where environmentally cleaner buses were being used to improve pollution. Mr Campbell reported that Stagecoach was looking at the same vehicles currently used in Southampton. He outlined that buses purchased since 2007 were of the latest European standards and were what the Councils had asked Stagecoach to invest in. Some of the buses used at the bus station were older and Stagecoach would be looking to replace them over a period of time, but it was also noted that other operators used the bus station as well. Mr Campbell emphasised that all Stagecoach buses were fitted with an engine cut-off facility that would come into effect after 5 minutes of the engine running when the vehicle was stationary.

Councillor Roger Hickford asked Mr Campbell to elaborate on his views of the bus schemes that had been included as part of the Executive Board's tranche one priority list.

Mr Campbell's main concern was in terms of the city centre and what would happen once people got there if nothing was done to the city centre itself. The schemes would enable buses to get to Cambridge quicker, but would then be stuck in and add to the congestion in the centre of the city. Without addressing the congestion in the city centre, Cambridge would not be able to have the transport infrastructure in place that it needed.

Helen Valentine asked for Mr Campbell's views on banning cars from the city centre, or managing car use at peak times.

Mr Campbell responded by saying that a total ban on cars would have a detrimental impact on retail trade and people visiting the city. He emphasised that he was not looking to see a total ban on cars using the city centre but was in favour of monitoring peak times of day and having controls in place to spread the congestion in favour of those people using public transport.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman, asked Mr Campbell how he thought the City Deal's capital funding could help in the support for services where there were not any currently.

Mr Campbell reflected on the rural nature of Greater Cambridge and the significant number of small villages that were spread across the area. These villages did not necessarily want to be linked with each other and would prefer a direct service into the city, which was not currently deliverable. However, Mr Campbell felt that this was one of the things that could be looked into for some villages in the future due to more capacity derived from quicker and more reliable journey times during peak hours, should the City Deal invest in a better transport infrastructure in and around Cambridge.

Councillor Noel Kavanagh referred to the introduction of 20mph speed limits and asked Mr Campbell how that had impacted on timetables.

Mr Campbell agreed with the introduction of 20mph at residential areas and housing estates, but did have some reservations when looking at other roads such as C-roads. The introduction of 20mph limits had resulted in changes to some routes, as a reduction in speed meant that routes had to be shortened or additional resources put in place to ensure that services were not detrimentally affected. In terms of what had happened to date, Mr Campbell reported that it was manageable from his perspective.

The Chairman thanked Andy Campbell for his attendance and contributions at this meeting.

7. REPORTS SCHEDULED FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL EXECUTIVE BOARD

7 (a) Proposal to establish a Greater Cambridge City Deal Housing Development Vehicle

The Joint Assembly gave consideration to a report scheduled for submission to the Executive Board on 27 March 2015 which set out a proposal to establish a Greater Cambridge City Deal Housing Development Vehicle.

Liz Bisset, Director of Customer and Community Services at Cambridge City Council, presented the report which outlined how the proposed Housing Development Vehicle would deliver the City Deal's commitment to deliver an additional 1,000 dwellings on exception sites by 2031. She stated that the establishment of a Housing Development Vehicle would enable the effective and efficient delivery of the various new build programmes associated with the City Deal, including:

- the development of County Council land holdings;
- Housing Revenue Account developments for South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City, including the recent proposal for the City Council to invest General Fund capital in housing;
- Ermine Street Housing;

- other City Deal Joint Ventures or Special Purpose Ventures.

This would ensure good project management and control over costs, as well as generate a potential revenue surplus for the City Deal partners. It was noted that a Housing Development Vehicle would maximise the benefits of both Council's Housing Revenue Account build programmes, and other new build programmes financed through the General Fund and would share resources and expertise.

The proposal included the cost of funding a team for the first two years, by which time the Housing Development Vehicle should operate on a self-funded basis. Without this investment in the Housing Development Vehicle it would take much longer for each respective Council to deliver the City Deal's housing development objectives. It was noted that the proposal sought to bring together expertise, but that this would not take anything away from each Council in respect of their respective governance arrangements and development programmes. Clarity was also given that the Development Vehicle was about delivery and would therefore not be an asset holding.

In answer to a question about the delivery of additional homes, it was noted that the Housing Development Vehicle would have to distinguish between housing that each Council was developing and development that each Council was enabling. The different roles of the Housing Development Vehicle and the Councils would need to be made very clear, and it would also be necessary for the Development Vehicle to act fairly towards other developers offering affordable housing.

Concern was expressed that this proposal should have been considered by the three partner Councils before being submitted to the Executive Board. It was also highlighted that this proposal was only one model of delivery and other models, together with options appraisals and alternatives, should have been included for consideration. An example of Cambridge Horizons was cited and clarity was sought as to how the proposed approach differed from the Cambridge Horizons model.

Liz Bisset explained that this proposal was being reported throughout the City Deal arrangements because of the significance of housing provision on the economy and the need to meet the City Deal's commitment with regard to additional affordable homes. With regard to the Cambridge Horizons model, she reported that Cambridge Horizons was largely funded by the Government and in comparison was expensive. The model did bring some considerable success with it and a lot of the growth now taking place in the Greater Cambridge area had been facilitated by that structure and the proposal set out in the report was, in a way, a version of that collaborative working. It was emphasised that the proposal at this stage was to seek approval for the funding in order to set up the Housing Development Vehicle, with the formal structure and much more detailed model to be worked up and subsequently reported to and considered by each partner Council.

In answer to a question about the speeding up of delivery as part of the Housing Development Vehicle, it was noted that the Development Vehicle would work on pipeline proposals that were significant and could accelerate development in the city.

Clarification was sought as to whether the proposal was essentially permission to recruit seven posts to establish a team that would be responsible for delivering the Housing Development Vehicle. It was noted that this was correct, with the proposed posts set out in paragraph 35 of the report, although it was noted that some of these would be accommodated by way of transferring resources from the partner Councils. Members supported the proposal, in principle, but requested a report back on the details of the business case and specifications of the seven posts set out in the report. It was noted that this should be available by the June meetings of the Joint Assembly and Executive Board,

prior to reporting into the three partner Councils as part of their July cycle of meetings.

The Joint Assembly **RECOMMENDED** to the Executive Board that it approves funding, in principle, of £200,000 in 2015/16 and £200,000 in 2016/17 to support the establishment of a City Deal Housing Development Vehicle, subject to further details being made available on the business case and the specification of personnel required to establish the Joint Development Vehicle.

7 (b) Greater Cambridge City Deal partnership budget 2015/16

Consideration was given to a report scheduled for submission to the Executive Board on 27 March 2015 which sought approval of a budget for non-project costs for the 2015/16 financial year.

Chris Malyon, Chief Finance Officer at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report and stated that the funding in relation to the Housing Development Vehicle had been included in the budget, but that the Assembly's 'in principle' support would be taken into account when presented to the Executive Board.

Mr Malyon clarified that non-project costs were those costs associated with delivering the broad range of City Deal outcomes beyond the capital costs of delivering the infrastructure investments. These included the delivery of additional affordable housing in the Greater Cambridge area, the creation of over 400 new apprenticeships, exploration of smart or digital solutions to the area's economic barriers, assessment of the economic impact of the City Deal programme and the co-ordination, leadership and communication of the initiative overall.

In going through each section of the report, discussion ensued as follows:

Central leadership and co-ordinating functions

Clarification was sought as to whether this section of the report was essentially seeking permission to fund the recruitment of two posts by way of a Programme Director and a Project Manager. Members of the Assembly noted that that this was correct, with the draft roles of both posts set out in Appendix A of the report. Furthermore, it was intended that the Programme Director would report to one of the three partner Council Chief Executives, whichever was supporting the Chairman of the Executive Board. The overarching role of the Programme Director would principally be to deliver the objectives of the City Deal. Joint Assembly Members expressed the importance of ensuring that the Executive Board gave significant thought to the sort of person it wanted appointing as Programme Director, emphasising how crucial it would be to get the right person in place.

Reassurance was given to Members of the Assembly that, in supporting delivery of the City Deal, the Programme Director and Project Manager posts would support the work of the Joint Assembly. This was also the case for any officer working on any aspect of the City Deal.

Strategic communications

It was noted that this section of the report also sought permission to recruit.

The Chairman stated that the Joint Assembly would also need some support in this area to assist in the promotion of its work and the communication of key messages.

Skills and economic assessment

The skills aspect of the report would be considered as part of a separate item at this meeting. The economic assessment section was noted.

Smart Greater Cambridge

Clarification was sought as to what the proposed £20,000 would be spent on. The notion was that this money would be made available to buy-in expertise, run events and potentially run pilot schemes, as well as potentially take advantage of other funding streams.

Inward investment

Cambridge Network was leading development of a project to promote Greater Cambridge as a place to find and buy products and services, a place to invest, a place to do research and development, as well as support Greater Cambridge companies in trading and bringing in investment and be a gateway and advisory service for those wishing to locate and invest in the area. The City Deal partner Councils were being asked to contribute £60,000 for 2015/16 and £90,000 for 2016/17. Claire Ruskin, Chief Executive of Cambridge Network, explained that the project would cost approximately £200,000 to run per year, with other sources of funding expected from other bodies such as the Local Enterprise Partnership and the University. She explained that the project would operate a sustainable funding model after the first two years, meaning that no further investment from City Deal partners would be necessary to support delivery of the project.

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

- (a) The following options in relation to the functions set out in the report be adopted and that budgetary provision be made within the 2015/16 Greater Cambridge City Deal non-project costs budget for:
 - central coordinating functions in the sum of £150,000 per year for two years;
 - strategic communications in the sum of £60,000 for two years;
 - economic assessments in the sum of £10,000 per year for two years;
 - Smart City in the sum of £20,000 per year for two years;
 - inward investment team to a maximum sum of £150,000, subject to the conditions set out in that section of the report;
 - support for the delivery of additional housing in the sum of £200,000 per year for two years.
- (b) The City Deal budget for non-project costs as set out in section 6 of the report be approved for the financial year commencing 1 April 2015.
- (c) The currently unutilised funding, as set out in section 8 of the report, be retained for other needs that are expected to arise to progress the City Deal objectives, including potential investment in infrastructure schemes, and be carried forward at the year-end subject to any further demands that may be agreed by the Board within the financial year.
- (d) These allocations be reviewed at the mid-year point and any amendments to these sums or additional elements be made at that point.

7 (c) Proposals for developing the next stages of the Greater Cambridge City Deal transport programme and city centre congestion

The Joint Assembly considered a report scheduled for consideration by the Executive Board on 27 March 2015 which outlined the proposed process for developing the transport programme for the next steps of the City Deal. In addition it sought to identify how the Cambridge congestion issues would be dealt with in the context of the wider transport strategy for the Greater Cambridge area.

Developing the next stages of the City Deal transport programme

Graham Hughes, Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report and reflected on the process that had been followed in respect of the first tranche of priority schemes. The prioritised tranche one infrastructure programme to be worked up in further detail was agreed by the Executive Board at its meeting on 28 January 2015. Within that prioritised programme was an allocation for programme development in years six to ten, recognising the importance of working up detail around the schemes to be delivered from 2020 onwards as well. It was noted that tranche two of the City Deal funding would amount to £200 million in five annual instalments from 2020/21 to 2025/26.

It was proposed that all of the transport schemes not included as part of the tranche one prioritised list be reconsidered using the same prioritisation tool that had been used previously as developed by Cambridge Econometrics and SQW. This assessment would take account of the schemes that had already been prioritised and the planned developments emerging through Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils' Local Plans. This work could be undertaken over the summer and be reported back to the Joint Assembly for consideration in the Autumn before proceeding to the Executive Board.

Councillor Bridget Smith referred to the contributions made earlier in the meeting as part of questions from the public with regard to rural cycling schemes. She proposed that the original reserve list as part of the tranche one prioritisation exercise be re-established, and put forward the following proposition:

"The Joint Assembly welcomes the success of the County Council's bid to the Cycling City Ambition Fund and notes that it should enable parts of the rural cycling projects, considered at the last meeting, to proceed independent of the City Deal. It also recommends to the Executive Board that the originally tabled cycling infrastructure schemes (or parts of them) that are not funded from the Cycling City Ambition Fund or any other external source should be treated as reserve projects within tranche one of the City Deal programme, due to the acknowledged high risk of many of the bigger prioritised schemes, the cycling projects' attractive value for money in terms of enabling economic growth, their deliverability and 'spade ready' status and the role they can play in connecting people with jobs within the specific demographic of the Cambridge technology cluster."

The following points were noted in discussing this proposition:

- one of the reasons for some schemes not being included as priorities was because other sources of funding were available, such as the Cycling City Ambition Fund;
- using other funding sources would ensure quicker delivery of certain schemes;

- the current priority list for tranche one was already oversubscribed at £180 million, in view of the fact that the first tranche of City Deal funding only totalled £100 million;
- the public response to the lack of cycle ways in the tranche one priority schemes indicated that there was a demand for rural cycleway schemes and those views should be taken into account;
- in order to drive a modal shift, cycleway projects needed to be delivered as complete routes rather than delivered in smaller segments;
- schemes should still be included within the reserve list and subsequently removed in the event that other funding sources were identified for them.

The Chairman asked whether new schemes could be added to the priority list for tranche two if they had not already been identified as part of the original prioritisation process that took place in tranche one. Mr Hughes confirmed that any additional schemes identified as part of further prioritisation work could be added to the process at that stage.

In discussing additional sources of funding, it was suggested that all known additional funding streams be included in the report scheduled to come back to the Board in the Autumn on tranche two priority schemes. It was noted that it was not always known until very short notice what funding streams were available to bid for, but officers agreed to include all known additional funding streams, particularly regular sources of additional funding such as developer contributions, for example.

City centre congestion

A significant package of £22.6 million was made towards city centre capacity improvements as part of the tranche one prioritisation process. The partner Councils had commissioned consultants to undertake works to look at a wide range of measures to free up movement within Cambridge and connect with the other schemes being delivered through the City Deal. Although this was not clearly defined at the moment, it was accepted that the city centre scheme had to be more radical than the other City Deal schemes, and officers had suggested themes for further exploration that could be categorised as follows:

- more restrictions on movement, such as current access controls through the Core Traffic Scheme;
- demand management, which could be fiscal (such as workplace parking levies) or physical (such as additional parking restrictions);
- capacity enhancement, such as further bus priorities which were likely to be at the expense of capacity for cars in the most central areas;
- behavioural measures, to encourage other modes of transport.

Subject to Executive Board agreement, it was noted that a high level analysis of this work on these four themes could be available for reporting to the June cycle of Joint Assembly and Executive Board meetings.

Discussing the public consultation process that would be followed for infrastructure schemes, in order to ensure the highest possible level of contribution and most balanced responses, it was suggested that this should not be confined to the summer period when a lot of the population, including much of the academic community, was not resident.

Voting on the recommendations set out in the Executive Board report, the Joint Assembly **RECOMMENDED** to the Executive Board that it:

- (a) Approves the process for developing the transport programme for the next stage of the City Deal and to address congestion in Cambridge.
- (b) Approves the process to commence the development of proposals to address congestion in Cambridge.

Voting on Councillor Bridget Smith's proposal, the Joint Assembly welcomed the success of the County Council's bid to the Cycling City Ambition Fund and noted that it should enable parts of the rural cycling projects, considered at the last meeting, to proceed independent of the City Deal. It also **RECOMMENDED** to the Executive Board that the originally tabled cycling infrastructure schemes (or parts of them) that are not funded from the Cycling City Ambition Fund or any other external source should be treated as reserve projects within tranche one of the City Deal programme, due to the acknowledged high risk of many of the bigger prioritised schemes, the cycling projects' attractive value for money in terms of enabling economic growth, their deliverability and 'spade ready' status and the role they can play in connecting people with jobs within the specific demographic of the Cambridge technology cluster.

8. REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL JOINT ASSEMBLY

8 (a) Greater Cambridge City Deal skills proposals

A report was considered which outlined for the Joint Assembly the potential means by which the skills element of the City Deal could be achieved, and to seek views on whether this or another mechanism was the most appropriate way forward.

Graham Hughes, Cambridgeshire County Council's Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment, presented the report which set out examples of existing training provision with regard to funding received through the Adult Learning and Skills Grant, training offered by further education institutions and private training providers, as well as the training opportunities provided by some of the county's larger employers. Also included in the report was an overview of the role of the National Careers Service, the Skills Service provided by the Local Enterprise Partnership, the Cambridge Area Partnership and the Huntingdonshire 'skills hub'.

It was noted that through the negotiations on the City Deal, the skills element was agreed with the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills and this included a Skills Service model to bridge the gap between employer needs and aspirations of learners. Mr Hughes indicated that young people in Cambridgeshire were currently making choices about their development, further education and future careers that could not necessarily be supported by the local economy in terms of potential employment opportunities. As part of the City Deal, partners had also committed to deliver a further 420 apprenticeships in the first five years of the Deal.

The report set out a proposed way forward for delivering these requirements, mirroring what was currently being delivered by the Local Enterprise Partnership through its Skills Service model. This would involve the formation of a team of people who would:

- visit schools and colleges and work with their internal careers services and young people to explain what opportunities there were in the area in terms of training and employment;

- work with businesses to understand their needs and relay this back to young people and training providers, both in terms of needs currently and needs in the future;
- connect with training providers to assist in developing and providing appropriate courses to meet the needs of local businesses;
- undertake research into current and future needs;
- market the opportunities available in terms of apprenticeships.

In discussing the proposed Skills Service model, the following points were noted:

- the Cambridge Area Partnership representation should continue working on building links with employers;
- work on the skills agenda was already taking place. It was important to recognise that and note that the proposed Skills Service model would be building on work already undertaken;
- colleges were already doing a lot to provide people with appropriate skills meaning that they would soon be ready to enter into employment in the Greater Cambridge area;
- there were lots of examples of apprenticeships happening across the Greater Cambridge area;
- work already undertaken on the skills agenda should be brought together so that it was clear where the real gaps were and that clear outcomes were articulated about what was seeking to be achieved;
- it was unclear how success could be monitored going forward. Targets should be put in place that were specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-constrained;
- the proposed investment did not seem to be large or ambitious enough in view of this issue being at the core of what the City Deal sought to achieve;
- alternative models such as building on the Cambridge Network grant model discussed earlier at this meeting in respect of inward investment, or offering grants to other organisations, should be explored further. This could involve key stakeholders bidding for funding to deliver aspects of the skills agenda;
- the proposal was very modest considering the challenges that would lie ahead as part of this huge agenda;
- Figure 1 of the report, which set out the current situation with regard to training and development provision in the county, did not accurately represent what happened with regard to training and development at large companies in the area such as AstraZeneca;
- the proposal should not create any unnecessary bureaucracy;

In response to the comments put forward by Members, Mr Hughes reassured Members that the proposal did not seek to introduce bureaucracy and emphasised that it sought to fill the gaps. He acknowledged that some things were working very well in the area, but also recognised things that were not working and did not feel that the processes around learners, providers and employers were sufficiently joined up. This was what the Skills Service proposal would look to resolve.

In terms of the proposed investment and whether it would be enough to deliver the City Deal's objectives in relation to skills, the investment for this proposal was solely to set up a mechanism to ensure that the right courses and opportunities were in place and that people were attending them. The proposal was not about providing the actual courses as these would be delivered and paid for by the Skills Funding Agency. Regarding delivery, Mr Hughes made the point that it had to be independent of any one single provider, with a more generalised approach to ensure that there was fairness in the system and that

specific providers were not seen as being favoured. It was also noted that the Cambridge Network Partnership catered for young people between the age of 14 to 19, whereas the City Deal objectives included people up to the age of 24. Responding to the point about how success was measured, Mr Hughes stated that the ultimate measure would be how the work undertaken on skills contributed to the local economy.

It was suggested that an informal group of Joint Assembly Members could be established to review the options available and engage with key partners, stakeholders and officers. Councillor Tim Bick, Anne Constantine, Councillor Noel Kavanagh, Claire Ruskin and Andy Williams were put forward as interested parties should such a group be set up.

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

- (a) Approves the principle of the Skills Service model as the basis for achievement of the City Deal objective on skills and requests a further report containing the detailed proposals for the Skills Service for submission to the June meetings of the Joint Assembly and the Executive Board.
- (b) Establishes an informal group of Joint Assembly Members to meet and work with officers, key partners and stakeholders, that will feed into the report for submission to the June meetings of the Joint Assembly and Executive Board.
- (c) Allocates a minimum of £250,000 per annum, in principle, as the estimated gross cost of funding the model and the availability of contributions towards this from the County Council (£50,000) and the Local Enterprise Partnership (£75,000), therefore approving a minimum net budgetary provision of £125,000 per annum.

9. WORK PROGRAMME AND SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS

The Joint Assembly:

- (a) **NOTED** its work programme for 2015, subject to the inclusion of further items agreed during consideration of previous items at this meeting.
- (b) **AGREED** that the next meeting of the Joint Assembly would be held on 3 June 2015 at 2pm.
- (c) **DELEGATED** confirmation of the schedule of meetings for the remainder of 2015 to the Democratic Services Team Leader at South Cambridgeshire District Council, in consultation with the Chairman.

The Meeting ended at 1.40 p.m.
