



GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL JOINT ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly held on
Wednesday, 3 June 2015 at 2.00 p.m.

Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly:

Councillor Dave Baigent	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Tim Bick	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Kevin Price	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Roger Hickford	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Noel Kavanagh	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Maurice Leeke	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Francis Burkitt	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Bridget Smith	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Sir Michael Marshall	Marshall Group
Claire Ruskin	Cambridge Network
Andy Williams	AstraZeneca
Anne Constantine	Cambridge Regional College
Jane Ramsey	Cambridge University Hospitals
Helen Valentine	Anglia Ruskin University

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

Councillor Lewis Herbert	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Ray Manning	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Ian Bates	Cambridgeshire County Council

Officers/advisors

Liz Bisset	Cambridge City Council
Alan Carter	Cambridge City Council
Andrew Limb	Cambridge City Council
Aaron Blowers	Cambridgeshire County Council
Graham Hughes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Mark Lloyd	Cambridgeshire County Council
Chris Malyon	Cambridgeshire County Council
Adrian Cannard	Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership
Alex Colyer	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Graham Watts	South Cambridgeshire District Council

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Councillor Tim Bick was **ELECTED** as Chairman of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly for 2015/16.

2. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

Councillor Roger Hickford was **ELECTED** as Vice-Chairman of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly for 2015/16.

3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Tim Wotherspoon (South Cambridgeshire District Council).

4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 6 March 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record, subject to the correction of a typographical error on the final paragraph of page 4.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

6. QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

A number of questions had been received in relation to item 8(a). The Chairman agreed to accept receipt of these questions as part of considering that item.

7. PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

8. REPORTS SCHEDULED FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL EXECUTIVE BOARD**8 (a) A428/A1303 Madingley Road Corridor Scheme options and approval to consult**

The Joint Assembly considered a report which set out the high-level options that had emerged from the initial stages of the A428/A1303 corridor technical study.

Stuart Walmsley, Head of Major Infrastructure Delivery at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report which reflected on wide-ranging technical work that had identified six shortlisted options now proposed for public consultation. Three of the options were for the east of Madingley Mulch, with the remaining three relevant to the west of Madingley Mulch. The report set out conceptual plans and commentary for each option, together with a consultation strategy for consideration.

The Chairman took this opportunity to invite members of the public and local Councillors to put forward questions. As they were relevant to the contents of the report, it was noted that answers were likely to be provided or respective issues raised as part of the debate. Questions were asked, with initial answers provided, as follows:

Robin Pellew

“On the matter of the A428 transport corridor, the point I want to make is that the transport must service the maximum number of people particularly the new residential and employment areas to the West of Cambridge. Therefore the proposed busway should commence at St Neots where extensive new residential development is underway, link through the centre of Cambourne and Bourne Airfield, and then be routed through the University developments of North West Cambridge and West Cambridge before joining Madingley Road into the City.”

Mr Pellew also referred to the Local Development Plan and said that one of the reasons cited by the Inspectors for suspending its examination related to their concerns in respect of the availability of City Deal funding and there being no other alternatives should it not materialise. He called on the Joint Assembly to work with the Councils concerned and provide the Inspectors with any information they needed in order that they had necessary assurances regarding future receipt of City Deal funding.

Graham Hughes, Cambridgeshire County Council's Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment, informed Mr Pellew that the first tranche of funding, consisting of £100 million, was as guaranteed as it could be and that City Deal partners continued to work closely with Government on the mechanism to unlock funding from tranches two and three. He was confident that if schemes and objectives were delivered with triggers met, the funding would be received.

The Chairman reminded those present that discussion on the Inspector's decision to suspend examination of the Local Development Plan was outside of the Joint Assembly's remit.

Rob Hopwood

"The National Planning Policy Framework requires any plan to be justified with the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives based on proportionate evidence. Why, therefore has the land immediately to the south of the A428/A1303 Madingley Mulch junction not been included as a potential Park and Ride site option at this initial stage of investigation? As it has not been included as an option at this initial stage of consideration does it mean that it cannot be considered later on in the process?"

Mr Hopwood circulated a plan at the meeting which showed the area of land he referred to.

Mr Walmsley confirmed that a number of options were being considered, all of which at this moment in time were indicative. He added that it would be important to understand how these sites would work, but emphasised that all possibilities were being looking into.

Stephen Coates

"Given the immense damage route 1(c) would cause to the rural and park setting of the Historic City and its key historic grade I buildings and indeed the grade I Backs and other registered parks and gardens, the inappropriateness and possible long delays on Silver Street and then Pembroke/Downing Street, the fact it will cost almost £50 million pounds more than the alternatives despite only saving three minutes, the environmental damage and uncertainty, the flooding issues, the better connections to employment centres of the alternative routes, then as per clause 5.2 should not this option be "sifted out at an early stage" as it is clearly unfeasible to save abortive work on detailed design for a proposal which is clearly unacceptable?"

Mr Walmsley responded by saying that the issues raised by Mr Coates were very credible and would need to be built into the process as it progressed. He added that it would be important to work together in order that the right solution could be achieved, but emphasised that this scheme was not a stand alone project and that it would link in with other City Deal approved schemes. This consultation would provide an opportunity to receive conceptual views as to what people wanted to see.

City Councillor Markus Gehring

Councillor Gehring sought an explanation of the rationale behind option 1(c) and clarification on the exact routing through the green belt together with connecting the bus route to Grange Road and the continuation along Silver Street. He also wanted to know if there were rough cost estimates for a new bridge across the M11 for option 1(c). Councillor Gehring reported that since his election in May 2015 he had been contacted by a number of residents who had expressed their strong objections to the proposal set out in option 1(c). He shared their concerns as he felt that this clearly pierced the green belt and was also concerned about the additional impact the proposed option would have on Grange Road, where most of the congestion problems already started. In addition, Councillor Gehring was fearful of the impact this option would have on the area in terms of potential development, which could ruin its unique character.

Mr Hughes responded by saying that this option, as with all options in the report, was very indicative at this stage and merely represented principles that needed testing. Once the consultation commenced it could be that alternative options were received, or even hybrids consisting of parts of the existing options put forward for consideration. Detailed work around the precise proposed locations of routes could then be undertaken, but he emphasised that the routes set out in the options in the report at this stage were concepts. He explained that this was normal practice for major infrastructure schemes as the subsequent detailed work and studies that needed to take place were very expensive. Initially consulting on options as concepts at an early stage meant that options could be ruled out if necessary before any detailed work or studies took place.

Mr Walmsley explained that an 'off-line' route needed to be included in the consultation as an option so that this concept could be included for consideration, which was the rationale behind option 1(c). He reiterated that this scheme was not a stand alone scheme and would feed into other City Deal approved schemes. The congestion problems at Grange Road, for example, would be included as part of the City centre congestion scheme.

Parish Councillor Helen Bradbury

Councillor Bradbury agreed with the points made by Mr Coates and Councillor Gehring. She reported that the Parish Council was particularly concerned with option 1(c) in respect of what it felt was a highly confusing and potentially misleading way in which it had been presented in the report. Councillor Bradbury added that the map was worryingly inaccurate in its representation of Coton, ignoring the significant portions of the village extending northwards on both sides of Cambridge Road and eastwards towards the M11 along the footpath. The Parish Council therefore asked for clarification of the route of option 1(c) as it passed the village of Coton and crossed the M11, together with a detailed description of any interactions between the route and any residential areas of Coton and any of the roads in or serving Coton, including Cambridge Road, High Street, Whitwell Way and the footpath. The Parish Council also sought clarity as to whether the "new crossing over the M11" was intended to incorporate or replace the current pedestrian bridge over the M11 at the end of the footpath.

Mr Walmsley said that the proposal at this stage was for a replacement bridge, but clarified that these were the kind of questions that would need to be considered as part of the process going forward.

The explanation as to the rationale behind option 1(c) given to the previous question was noted. Mr Hughes reiterated his earlier point that the details of the map and the routes included within it were only conceptual at this stage.

Oscar Hughes

"What consideration has been given to integration of these plans with the West Cambridge to central Cambridge cycle route, which forms part of the Section 106 agreement for the West Cambridge site?"

Graham Hughes responded by saying that this would be built into the process as part of the overall study that would be carried out, but acknowledged that modal shift would be an important aspect.

County Councillor Lucy Nethsingha

"Given the very high cost of the bridge over the motorway for option 1(c), I wondered whether any work had been done to explore the possibility of combining elements of option 1(b) and 1(c), such that there was an off-road bus route behind the American Cemetery, crossing the motorway using the current bridge, and then moving off road again, through the University West Cambridge site.

I would also like to know what the impact of options 1(a) and 1(b) would be on the current cycle and pedestrian facilities along Madingley Road, which are very well used."

Mr Walmsley confirmed that surveys needed to be undertaken that would define how these things could all fit together. At that stage it would be possible to consider safer routes and he added that the more opportunities that could be created in terms of modal shift, the more that could be put in place to support this.

Edward Leigh

"How does an inbound only bus lane on Madingley Road solve long-term problems of congestion in both directions? Does a single bus lane on Madingley Road provide a better return, in terms of economic growth and population health, than creating high quality segregated cycle ways? Doesn't shifting buses onto new busways or bus lanes simply enable more traffic to enter the city, exacerbating congestion, danger to pedestrians, noise and pollution in the centre?"

Shouldn't the top priority for new Park and Ride capacity be at the A14-M11-A428 interchange, where there is an ideal site? This would remove traffic from Huntingdon Road and from the A14 to Milton Park and Ride.

Why is there no proposal for high quality pedestrian and cycle links along the Cambridge to Cambourne corridor, linking with Madingley Park and Ride, West and North West Cambridge sites, the Coton cycle path, and villages along the A428? Connecting communities with each other, and with local schools, shops and amenities reduces car use for short journeys and has valuable social and health benefits. The merits of such a proposal would stand, whatever new housing developments end up in the new Local Plan, and whatever the consultation with city traffic generators concludes."

Mr Walmsley referred to previous points made in response to other questions that were relevant to the questions Mr Leigh had asked. He reiterated that the more that could be done with regard to modal shift the more that could be done to improve provision for cycling.

It was also emphasised that the objective of City Deal infrastructure schemes was not to make more room for private motor vehicles, with other sustainable modes of transport taking priority.

District Councillor Des O'Brien

"Can the assembly clarify their position with respect to the apportioning of City Deal funds in light of the decision by inspectors Laura Graham and Alan Wood to indefinitely suspend the SDCDC Local Plan? Surely any commitments at this stage, when serious questions remain regarding the soundness on the Local Plan, would be premature, if not financially injudicious?"

Councillor Des O'Brien was not in attendance to ask his question, which was noted. The Chairman reminded Members of an answer to a previous question in respect of the examination of the Local Development Plan and the remit of the Joint Assembly.

The Chairman thanked members of the public and local Councillors for their questions, and invited Members of the Joint Assembly to debate the report that had been presented.

General comments by Joint Assembly Members were noted as follows:

- it should be made very clear for future consultation reports, especially in respect of the maps provided, that routes were only concepts to identify potential options for consideration and that the line on the map did not necessarily reflect a proposal for a specific route or road in that location;
- option 1(c) essentially cut a swathe through the green belt, which would be very damaging and could open up the area for development;
- the options in the report demonstrated a huge appetite for bus lanes, resulting in improved journey times, but there was a lack of reference, especially within option (a), to cycling provision. It was suggested that the options be strengthened where possible to ensure that cycling provision was included as part of the proposals for each, with a dedicated cycleway perhaps following the proposed busway in option 1(c);
- referring to the table set out in the report, which set out comparisons of journey times between the three options for east of Madingley Mulch, it was clear that segregated routes provided much more reliability. However, there was not much difference between the journey times between options 1(b) and 1(c) considering the significantly higher estimated cost of delivery for option 1(c);
- in terms of options for west of Madingley Mulch, it was difficult to justify spending money on the introduction of new busways when looking at the existing bus timetable and a perceived lack of demand;
- the ATKINS report, an interim study into the Madingley Road/A428 Corridor included as a background paper as part of the report, addressed a lot of the questions that had been raised at this meeting;
- the consultation process would provide anyone with an opportunity to put forward other suggestions or proposals if they felt they were better than the options presented;
- reference in the scheme engagement plan, as appended to the report, to this scheme being separate from the A428 dualling that was being looked into by Highways England should be made very clear as part of the consultation;
- in terms of consultees, the consultation should be wide ranging in order that residents from those villages impacted by the proposals, especially in relation to public transport, had an opportunity to put forward their views;
- busways with cycleways alongside them should be the model used for this scheme;
- it was useful to have radical and bold options at this early stage of the process as all options should be taken into account and considered.

The following points by officers in response to some of the comments above were noted:

- options could be altered or strengthened as part of the consultation process itself by individuals putting forward their suggestions;
- the main issue to consider as part of this scheme was connectivity and how this area should be accessed;
- an important aspect of the City Deal infrastructure programme was modal shift. A lack of demand for buses in certain areas could be due to the fact that currently there was no advantage of using a bus in that area as the infrastructure did not adequately support bus usage, making journey times longer than they should be and unreliable. If an infrastructure could be introduced that made buses more attractive to use because they were efficient, reliable and an effective alternative to private motor vehicles, the demand should increase. This had been the case with other initiatives in Cambridgeshire;
- reliability of bus routes was something that needed significant consideration and segregated routes provided a significantly higher level of reliability when compared to other alternatives;
- each option would include cycling and pedestrian provision as standard and this would be made very clear as part of the consultation process;
- more would also be done to make it clear that options put forward for consideration were only concepts and any lines or perceived routes included on maps did not necessarily reflect a proposal to introduce a road or route in that specific location.

Councillor Francis Burkitt put forward a number of proposals in response to the recommendations contained within the report. The Chairman invited debate on each of these proposals and a subsequent vote on each was taken, as follows:

- (a) That the Joint Assembly recommends to the Executive Board that it should note, approve and agree the items listed in paragraph 2.1 of the report.

This proposal was unanimously agreed.

- (b) That the Joint Assembly recommends to the Executive Board that the public consultation should:
- (i) include a question asking for the public's views on the optimum location for the new Park and Ride at Madingley Mulch;
 - (ii) contain a discussion or analysis of the benefits/disadvantages of retaining/closing the existing Madingley Road Park and Ride site;
 - (iii) briefly mention that, if the finally chosen scheme was for less than the £68m potential total available budget for the tranche one sections, the difference would be available for other City Deal projects (but does not go into detail as to what those other projects might be).

Discussing proposal (b)(i) above, Councillor Burkitt stated that the maps contained within the report already showed shaded areas as possible locations for a new Park and Ride site at Madingley Mulch. He therefore felt that public debate over this issue had already commenced and thought it was right that they should be formally asked their views as part of this consultation.

Mr Hughes noted that the location of the Park and Ride site was not part of the five year package for the first tranche of City Deal funding or the A428/A1303 Madingley Road Corridor Scheme and expressed concern that such a question would distract people from the main issue that needed addressing in respect of what to do with the Madingley Road

corridor. Other Park and Ride sites had only been included to demonstrate where this facility could potentially be in the future, but any new Park and Ride facility coming in would have to be cognisant with the bus infrastructure put in place as part of this scheme.

Councillor Hickford felt that the same principle should be applied with regard to the map in option 1(c), in terms of making it clear that the location of Park and Ride sites was only conceptual.

With 6 votes in favour, 5 against and 3 abstentions, Councillor Burkitt's proposal (b)(i) as above was agreed.

In terms of proposal (b)(ii) above, Councillor Burkitt said that the published corridor study assumed that the existing Madingley Road Park and Ride site remained open, but did not say why it assumed this and did not discuss the advantages or benefits of keeping it open or closing it.

Mr Hughes noted that the existing site was not the subject of the consultation in terms of the A428/A1303 Madingley Road Corridor Scheme. He added that there was a significant amount of investment currently within the existing site, that it currently serviced northbound M11 traffic and that there was still capacity at the site.

In answer to a question about whether relocation of the Park and Ride site could be brought forward to the first tranche, or very early in the second tranche of the City Deal, Mr Hughes reported that that this would cost in excess of £10 million and confirmed that there was also approximately £10 million of investment currently within the existing site. He felt that the relocation of the Park and Ride site in the first tranche would delay the delivery of other schemes that had already been agreed as priorities.

With 6 votes for, 3 against and 5 abstentions, Councillor Burkitt's proposal (b)(ii) as above was agreed.

Discussing proposal (b)(iii) above, Councillor Burkitt explained that savings would be retained locally rather than having to pass the money back to central Government.

Mr Hughes reminded Members of the Joint Assembly that a package of schemes totalling £180 million had been included within the first tranche of City Deal funding by the Board. There were therefore enough schemes within the programme to allow for the reallocation of funding if necessary. He made it clear, however, that whatever scheme came forward it would have to be supported by a positive business case.

With 3 votes in favour, 8 votes against and 3 abstentions, Councillor Burkitt's proposal (b)(iii) as above was lost.

- (c) That the Joint Assembly recommends to the Executive Board that the public consultation should instruct officers to produce a revised timetable based on 'approval of the City Deal Executive Board final scheme' being in May or October 2016, rather than December 2016 as currently shown, and explain what would need to change to achieve this timetable for the Executive Board then to consider.

Councillor Burkitt was of the opinion that the timetable in the report was very high-level, containing five separate tolerances of plus or minus two months in between now and the date the Board might approve the scheme. He suggested that the Board undertook a review-and-challenge approach to this report when it met with officers.

Mr Hughes felt that the current timetable as presented was reasonable and that a faster timetable would be unachievable considering the processes that needed to be followed. He outlined the different aspects that needed to be undertaken when delivering major infrastructure schemes, including consultation and engagement necessary which all took time and needed to be properly carried out.

This proposal was unanimously agreed.

- (d) That the Joint Assembly recommends to the Executive Board that the public consultation should establish an officer Project Board to develop the project and proposals agreed by the Executive Board, which would sit alongside a Local Liaison Forum to be established (as with other major projects) consisting of local County, City and District Members, parish representatives and other key stakeholders, to exchange information and ideas on the project and ensure there was full information as it progressed. In addition to this, it may be appropriate to establish a task and finish Member Working Group for particular issues and the need for this should be established on an ad hoc basis.

This proposal was unanimously agreed.

- (e) That the Joint Assembly recommends to the Executive Board that it should encourage Cambridge University (the freeholder of the existing Madingley Road Park and Ride site) to discuss with the City Council's Planning Department how the site might be developed for residential development (including for affordable housing, and all in a manner that reflects the aims and aspirations of the Greater Cambridge City Deal) if the Park and Ride was closed in the context of the opening of a new site at Madingley Mulch and if the existing site was to revert back to the University.

This proposal was unanimously agreed.

- (f) That the Joint Assembly recommended to the Executive Board that it should instruct officers to bring a report to the September cycle of Joint Assembly and Executive Board meetings containing an initial and high-level appraisal of the technical implications and costs of creating bus-only slip-roads:
- (i) at M11 junction 13: when turning off the A1303 (going east) onto the M11 (going south);
 - (ii) at the M11 junction 13: creating a bus lane alongside the existing sliproad off the M11, which would get priority treatment at the traffic lights;
 - (iii) at M11 junction 11: turning off the M11 (going south) between the existing farm and footbridge and the existing slip-road, then going round the corner of the farmland at Trumpington Meadows, running parallel to (and west of) Trumpington Road, and entering the Trumpington Road Park and Ride thence joining up to the Guided Busway.

Councillor Burkitt explained that this proposal sought to bring forward consideration of whether the M11's slip-roads could be improved in the near future.

With 8 votes in favour, 4 against and 2 abstentions, this proposal was agreed.

The Chairman thanked everyone for their contributions and confirmed that the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly **RECOMMENDED** to the Executive Board:

- (a) That it should:
 - (i) note the findings from the initial engineering assessment and technical study;
 - (ii) approve the public consultation on the options as set out in the report;
 - (iii) agree to receive a report on consultation later this year on a preferred option, or options, for full business case development.
- (b) That the public consultation should:
 - (i) include a question asking for the public's views on the optimum location for the new Park and Ride at Madingley Mulch;
 - (ii) contain a discussion or analysis of the benefits/disadvantages of retaining/closing the existing Madingley Road Park and Ride site.
- (c) That it should instruct officers to produce a revised timetable based on 'approval of the City Deal Executive Board final scheme' being in May or October 2016, rather than December 2016 as currently shown, and explain what would need to change to achieve this timetable for the Executive Board then to consider.
- (d) That it should establish an officer Project Board to develop the project and proposals agreed by the Executive Board, which would sit alongside a Local Liaison Forum to be established (as with other major projects) consisting of local County, City and District Members, parish representatives and other key stakeholders, to exchange information and ideas on the project and ensure there was full information as it progressed. In addition to this, it may be appropriate to establish a task and finish Member Working Group for particular issues and the need for this should be established on an ad hoc basis.
- (e) That it should encourage Cambridge University (the freeholder of the existing Madingley Road Park and Ride site) to discuss with the City Council's Planning Department how the site might be developed for residential development (including for affordable housing, and all in a manner that reflects the aims and aspirations of the Greater Cambridge City Deal) if the Park and Ride was closed in the context of the opening of a new site at Madingley Mulch and if the existing site was to revert back to the University.
- (f) That it should instruct officers to bring a report to the September cycle of Joint Assembly and Executive Board meetings containing an initial and high-level appraisal of the technical implications and costs of creating bus-only slip-roads:
 - (i) at M11 junction 13: when turning off the A1303 (going east) onto the M11 (going south);
 - (ii) at the M11 junction 13: creating a bus lane alongside the existing sliproad off the M11, which would get priority treatment at the traffic lights;
 - (iii) at M11 junction 11: turning off the M11 (going south) between the existing farm and footbridge and the existing slip-road, then going round the corner of the farmland at Trumpington Meadows, running parallel to (and west of) Trumpington Road, and entering the Trumpington Road Park and Ride thence joining up to the Guided Busway.

8 (b) Proposal for consulting on Cambridge City Centre access measures

Consideration was given to a report which outlined proposals to develop a strategy for addressing the congestion that occurred regularly in Cambridge City.

Graham Hughes, Cambridgeshire County Council's Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment, presented the report and highlighted that congestion was a significant issue within the morning and evening peak periods in Cambridge which, in the long run, would harm business and the environment.

The City Deal Executive Board had agreed to an initial consultation to develop this strategy at its meeting on 27 March 2015. Since that meeting officers had been looking at development of the strategy options and the consultation.

It was proposed that the following three stage approach to the development of this strategy be followed:

- an initial workshop of Joint Assembly and Executive Board Members to be held during June, informed by work undertaken so far on the extent of the problems and some new analysis of the current level of congestion;
- subsequent engagement with a range of the largest traffic generators in the city, such as major employers and academic institutions, schools and retailers. This would seek to develop plans with them on how their actions could address the congestion problems and what measures would need to be introduced in addition through the City Deal;
- following this engagement activity, a wider public consultation exercise would be undertaken to test the developing solutions.

It was proposed that implementation of an agreed strategy would take place over at least the first five years of the City Deal programme and a series of shorter and longer term measures was likely.

The Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly unanimously **RECOMMENDED** to the Executive Board:

- (a) That it approves the process for developing the strategy to address congestion issues in Cambridge City.
- (b) That it approves the development plans for an initial engagement exercise with key traffic generators in Cambridge City followed by a public consultation.

8 (c) Business case for the formation of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Housing Development Agency

The Joint Assembly considered a report which set out the business case for the formation of the Housing Development Agency.

Alex Colyer, South Cambridgeshire District Council's Executive Director (Corporate Services), presented the report and informed the Joint Assembly that the business case had been submitted to this body and the Executive Board for consideration in advance of the three partner Councils.

Alan Carter, Head of Strategic Housing at Cambridge City Council, reminded Members that the essential requirements for an organisation to successfully develop housing were land, funding, skills, knowledge and experience. Partners represented on the Greater Cambridge City Deal owned land in the Greater Cambridge area and had access to different funding streams. The skills and capacity of the three partner Councils would be optimised and combined as part of the Agency as a shared service, initially, to drive delivery of the additional houses that had been committed as part of the City Deal

objectives.

The business case itself was based on a target programme of at least 4,000 homes by 2031, which equated to an average of 250 homes per year. The business case also set out a self-sustainable funding model, with operational costs covered by fees charged to each capital development scheme. It was emphasised that the Agency would be commercially focused.

In answer to a question about the initial £400,000 of funding to set the agency up, it was noted that this would be paid by the three partner Councils as part of their New Homes Bonus contributions that had already been committed to the City Deal.

Options in the business case set out a collaborative model, a shared service model or a wholly partner owned local company model for the Housing Development Agency, with the shared service model recommended at this stage with a view to progressing to a partner owned local company. A question was asked as to why the partner owned local company could not be delivered at this stage and it was noted that it would take too long to set up in view of the urgent need to commence delivery in respect of additional homes. It was noted that it took approximately 15 months to establish South Cambridgeshire District Council's housing company, Ermine Street Housing Ltd.

Members of the Joint Assembly commended the way in which the business case had been written and outlined their support.

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the report.

8 (d) Skills

A report was considered which outlined proposals for a Skills Service for the Greater Cambridge area.

Graham Hughes, Cambridgeshire County Council's Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment, presented the report and referred to a working group that had been established consisting of Joint Assembly and Executive Board Members. This group had met twice to consider options for the proposed City Deal Skills Service.

The business model for the Skills Service was set out in the report, which would act as a broker and facilitate connections between schools, colleges and employers. This sought to guide students from education into working life, design curricula that fit local business needs, gather and share information on labour market trends and employer requirements, help young people think more strategically about their futures and provide activity programmes that offered students opportunities to improve their employability and careers awareness. This approach had been unanimously supported by the working group.

The commitment as part of the first tranche of City Deal funding was to deliver 420 additional apprenticeships and a question was asked about how many apprenticeship schemes there currently were. It was noted that there were approximately 20,000 in Cambridgeshire, but additional apprenticeships as part of the City Deal would only relate to those within the Greater Cambridge area. Data was available through the University on the number of apprenticeship schemes currently ongoing within the Greater Cambridge area and it was agreed that this would be circulated to all Members of the Joint Assembly.

The Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly **RECOMMENDED** to the Executive Board:

- (a) That it adopts the model of the Skills Service and its governance, as described in the report.
- (b) That it requests that officers establish the Skills Service so that it can start work at the beginning of the next academic year (September 2015).
- (c) That a Cambridge Area Partnership Secondary Head Teacher be co-opted onto the Working Group.

9. GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL WORK PROGRAMME AND SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS

The Joint Assembly considered the Greater Cambridge City Deal work programme for 2015/16 and requested that the Executive Board gave consideration as to whether it would be necessary to hold meetings in August and September given the relatively light workload currently planned for those meetings.

The work programme and schedule of meetings for the Joint Assembly were **NOTED**.

The Meeting ended at 5.10 p.m.

This page is left blank intentionally.