



**GREATER
CAMBRIDGE
CITY DEAL**

Securing future prosperity

GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL JOINT ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly held on
Thursday, 25 August 2016 at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly:

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

Officers/advisors:

Aaron Blowers	City Deal Partnership
Joanna Harrall	City Deal Partnership
Tanya Sheridan	City Deal Partnership
Alex Colyer	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Caroline Hunt	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Ian Senior	South Cambridgeshire District Council

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were noted from Helen Valentine and Councillors Noel Kavanagh, Bridget Smith and Tim Wotherspoon.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 7 July 2016 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Andy Williams declared a non-pecuniary interest regarding item 9 as a Director of Cambridge Network.

Claire Ruskin declared a non-pecuniary interest regarding item 9 as the report writer.

4. QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Question by Claire Tripp

Claire Tripp attended the meeting to represent the partners of the Biomedical Campus Delivery Group and asked the following question:

“The Cambridge Biomedical Campus partners understand the need for the 8 Point Plan and are supportive of the need to address the transport challenges. However, what are City Deal’s main strategic objectives over a 10-15-year timeframe?”

The background to the question was that partners were putting a lot of work into a new Campus Master Plan and an associated Campus Transport Strategy. Claire Tripp said it would be useful to gain at least a broad understanding of what the transport, and to a lesser extent housing, landscape may be like in 2025-30.

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, responded by reiterating the City Deal’s objectives which were to:

- enable a new wave of innovation-led growth that would facilitate the continued growth of the Cambridge phenomenon;
- invest in infrastructure, housing and skills to support local plans;
- improve connectivity, including connectivity between new homes and jobs sites;
- create conditions for continued economic growth and jobs growth;
- maintain a good quality of life and to enable South Cambridgeshire to continue to be a desirable place in which to live;
- ensure sustainable transport networks.

Councillor Tim Bick requested that any further detail in response to this question be shared. Assurance was provided that further detail would be made available on the City Deal website.

Question by Erik de Visser

Mr de Visser asked whether the City Deal was a sham and sought assurance that officers would listen to the Local Liaison Forums when, in his view, they had not taken proper notice so far to any of the responses to the public consultation.

Tanya Sheridan provided an assurance that consultation responses were carefully analysed in order to understand the public’s views on proposed options.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, provided assurance that the City Deal was not a sham, adding that he had attended the Milton Road and Histon Road Local Liaison Forum meetings and thought they had been very useful. He reiterated and emphasised to the public that their views were being listened to.

Question from Antony Carpen

Antony Carpen asked what specific plans Cambridge Regional College and Anglia Ruskin University had for hosting outreach events on the City Deal for their students.

Having spoken to Helen Valentine at Anglia Ruskin University, Tanya Sheridan responded with the following points:

- the University was very positive about engaging with students and staff, especially in areas such as cycling improvements and Smart Cambridge which were likely to be of particular interest to its students;
- posters and leaflets were regularly disseminated in order to advertise consultations;
- the bus stop panel continued to advertise relevant consultations including advertising tackling peak time congestion from the end of August to October;
- a consultation event for the Chisholm Trail was held at Anglia Ruskin University as it was a location near the proposed route.

It was noted that the City Deal had held an event at Cambridge Regional College for cross-city cycling and had attended its open day. As stakeholders, both Cambridge Regional College and Anglia Ruskin University had received information about consultations.

Mark Robertson, Interim Principal of Cambridge Regional College, informed Mr Carpen that the college was entirely open to engaging with the community in any way possible. It was already doing a great deal with regards to apprenticeships and welcomed ideas regarding wider engagement with the community.

Councillor Hickford acknowledged that engaging with young people was a challenge and thanked Mr Carpen for the question and for bringing the issue to the forefront.

Question from Lilian Rundblad

Lilian Rundblad said that a recommendation for an installation of a Signalised Pedestrian Crossing located near the Borrowdale Bus Stop had been brought forward to the Local Highways Improvement Bid 2014-2015 and listed as an approved project in 2015-2016 and made the point that this project has not yet been started.

She noted that on the City Deal Draft 70012012-GA-401 there was a proposed signalised pedestrian crossing outlined by the Borrowdale Bus Stop. Lilian Rundblad therefore asked whether this proposal had been coordinated with the Local Highways Improvement programme and if this construction would be starting in coordination with Local Highways Improvement programme in 2016 in accordance with its budget plans.

She emphasised that the safety of the local residents was of the greatest importance and should be adhered to urgently. A time plan for the Signalised Pedestrian Crossing by the Borrowdale Bus Stop was also requested.

Tanya Sheridan made the following points in response to the question:

- the potential for a new crossing to be provided on Histon Road near the Borrowdale bus stop through the County Council's Local Highways Improvement programme, was raised at an early stage in the Histon Road scheme development. The original intention was for a zebra crossing to be delivered through the programme, but the potential for the road to be widened to provide a bus lane and cycleways as part of the City Deal scheme had raised concerns over the safe operation of a zebra crossing across a wider road width;
- the close proximity of the safety camera to a new crossing location also caused a potential problem as the prescribed road markings required for a zebra crossing and safety camera could overlap, which could jeopardise their safe and legal operation. Against this background, it had not proved possible to deliver a zebra crossing as part of the Local Highways Improvement programme;

- the potential for the City Deal scheme to provide a new crossing as an alternative delivery mechanism was reflected in the plans in the Interim Options Report, which showed a potential new signalised crossing close to the existing bus stop;
- as the City Deal was taken forward, consideration would be given to the provision of a signalised crossing point in support of delivering improvements to walking and cycling trips on Histon Road. Careful consideration would be given to the exact location of a new crossing to ensure that it met local needs and did not interfere with the operation of the safety camera. The forthcoming design workshops being undertaken through the Local Liaison Forum would give an opportunity for the local community to inform this aspect of the scheme design;
- all safety camera locations across the county were under review by the County Council as part of a programme to upgrade cameras to new digital technology.

5. PETITIONS

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, presented a report which provided the Joint Assembly with an opportunity to consider the views expressed by the County Council at its meeting on 19 July 2016 in relation to a petition opposing the City deal plan to widen Milton Road to four lanes of traffic.

Councillor, Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, allowed further public questions that were relevant to this item.

Question from Dorcas Fowler

As an interested member of the public, living in Milton Road, Dorcas Fowler felt that it did not appear that sufficient detailed research had been done on traffic in Milton Road as the basis for the City Deal proposals. She therefore asked why destination statistics had not been collected on Milton Road rush hour traffic on weekdays, both in school term and out of school term.

In addition, she asked why steps had not been taken for a video camera to record traffic using the bus lane along Milton Road throughout the day which she said was likely to support the anecdotal evidence from those living along the road that buses rarely used it, except on approaching junctions.

Dorcas Fowler also expressed concern that a senior transport officer was not present at the meeting to provide a detailed answer to her question. Councillor Hickford gave an assurance that a written response would be provided to any aspects of the question that could not be answered fully at the meeting and that this would be made available on the City Deal website.

Tanya Sheridan made the following points in response to the questions:

- relevant aspects of the Milton Road scheme, such as the likely effects on traffic movements, were modelled using the Cambridge Sub-Regional Model. This model used a wide range of data sources including census, land use and traffic data. A series of traffic counts had been undertaken along Milton Road in 2014 to facilitate the modelling process, which was being refreshed to ensure all data sources were as up to date as possible;
- the scheme for Milton Road was focussed on delivering improved transport infrastructure to effectively manage the future travel demand resulting from the planned growth in the Greater Cambridge area and beyond, including Northstowe consisting of 10,000 homes, Waterbeach consisting of 8,000 to 9,000 homes and

Ely North consisting of 3,000 homes. This growth would mean significantly more journeys into Cambridge, with the already busy Milton Road expected to take a lot of this traffic. Reliable bus services, which required bus priority measures, would be a key element of the strategy for making sure housing growth did not lead to significantly increased transport congestion and bus lanes were part of that strategy for bus priority.

- doing nothing to ensure bus reliability could mean significantly worse air quality in the area;
- further work would need to be done to consider where bus lanes would be needed to ensure reliability of services.

Councillor Hickford asked if there was evidence of the frequency of use of bus lanes, further to which Tanya Sheridan explained that it was expected that buses would use bus lanes when there were traffic delays. A report carried out by Mott MacDonald showed the average speeds and lengths of delay.

Question from Anne Hamill

Anne Hamill expressed concern for the environmental degradation on Milton Road and asked whether the Joint Assembly would recommend that the Executive Board made a commitment to having an evenly spaced avenue of mature, flowering trees in green verges that were a minimum of 1-metre wide on each side of the whole length of Milton Road.

Tanya Sheridan responded with the following points:

- at its meeting on 9 June 2016, the Executive Board agreed various resolutions relating to a preferred option for the Milton Road scheme. These resolutions included an instruction to officers to ensure that the preferred option design for consultation included details of proposed landscape areas and tree planting. The Board confirmed that mature trees should be used for the scheme;
- the Executive Board also noted the important role of a Local Liaison Forum involving local councillors and stakeholder groups in the development of the detailed layout plans for consultation;
- a series of workshops were planned over the autumn period, to which a range of stakeholders would be invited in order to influence and inform the design work for the preferred option.

Question from Maureen Mace

Maureen Mace asked when roadworks for widening Milton Road started, how much delay for the buses did modelling statistics estimate during a normal working day as well as when the A14 was closed due to an accident or upgrading. In addition, she asked how many years from the start of the roadworks it would take until the decrease in the average bus journey time of 99 seconds was reached.

Tanya Sheridan responded to the question with the following points:

- consideration could only be given to the likely impact on delays during the construction of the City Deal scheme on Milton Road once the extent of the works that would be needed were clear;
- once the scheme design had been determined, a project delivery plan would be developed in partnership with an appointed contractor to address issues such as managing delays to traffic movements and maintaining access to properties;

- the timetable for construction of the scheme would take into account other activities on the road network in the north of the city, including the A14 improvements and other City Deal schemes.

Statement from Councillor Jocelynn Scutt

Councillor Jocelynn Scutt was invited to address the Joint Assembly on behalf of the Milton Road Local Liaison Forum. She highlighted that Councillors from outside the Milton area had emphasised the importance of the Milton Road petition and presented the following resolutions from the meeting of the Local Liaison Forum held on 9 August 2016 in respect of Oaktree Avenue and Hurst Park Avenue::

“The Milton Road Local Liaison Forum calls upon the City Deal Board to:

- (i) remove double bus lanes from its proposals for the section from Hurst Park Avenue to Oak Tree Avenue – that is, to revert to a minimum of three motorised lanes instead of four;
- (ii) remove the diagram/plan from the City Deal website which represents there being a four lane carriageway, or make it clear beyond doubt where it appears that this diagram/plan has no relevance to the proposal;
- (iii) confirm that independent, paid consultants expert in the field of public realm, landscaping, trees and verges will be appointed immediately to the City Deal project, and be an equal part of the Milton Road project as the engineers;
- (iv) consistent with (iii), appoint a firm of independent urban architects to develop new design options for the Milton Road streetscape.”

Discussion ensued on the Milton Road Local Liaison Forum resolutions, during which the following points were noted:

- Joint Assembly Members acknowledged the concern expressed by some residents about the Milton Road scheme proposals;
- Councillor Maurice Leeke proposed that the Joint Assembly made a recommendation to the Executive Board regarding Milton Road, in line with the proposal made by Anne Hamill, that a commitment be made to ‘having an evenly spaced avenue of mature, flowering trees in green verges that are a minimum of 1-metre wide on each side of the whole length of Milton Road’.
- Councillor Kevin Price, having informed the Assembly that he lived near Milton Road, pointed out that there were not currently trees on grass verges all the way along Milton Road and that the character of the road varied along it. Councillor Price advised that the proposal put forward by Anne Hamill and supported by Councillor Leeke, was too prescriptive. This view was supported by other members of the Assembly;
- Claire Ruskin pointed out that whilst the beauty of roads was important, so was the ability to travel on them. There was also a need to make sure residents could easily access their work places. Ms Ruskin expressed the view that the proposal could not be voted on, given the lack of evidence regarding its impact in transport terms;
- Dr John Wells advised that Anne Hamill’s proposal risked putting too tight constraints on the Milton Road scheme. Instead Dr Wells proposed an option for the Joint Assembly to support the aspirations of Ms Hamill’s proposal. Andy Williams seconded Dr Wells’ proposal;
- Councillor Tim Bick expressed the view that the aspiration for trees and verges should be supported;
- Tanya Sheridan explained that modelling would give an indication of the minimum

width of bus lanes and that the appointment of independent urban architects to develop new design options for the Milton Road streetscape would have an impact on budgets. She added that any changes to a scheme or project with time and budget implications would be for the Executive Board to decide.

Recognising the concerns expressed by Milton Road residents, the Joint Assembly was unanimously in favour of recommending that the Board made a commitment to having an aspiration for an avenue of mature green trees on each side of Milton Road, consistent with bus priority and high quality cycling provision.

The Joint Assembly:

- (a) **NOTED** the report and the comments raised by County Councillors during consideration of a petition at the meeting of Cambridgeshire County Council on 19 July 2016.
- (b) **NOTED AND SUPPORTED** the resolutions agreed at the Milton Road Local Liaison Forum meeting held on 9 August 2016, apart from (ii) and (iv) as above.
- (c) **RECOMMENDED** that the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board made a commitment to having an aspiration for an avenue of mature green trees on each side of Milton Road, consistent with bus priority and high quality cycling provision.

6. CITY DEAL FORWARD PLAN

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, presented the City Deal Forward Plan.

It was noted that the Chisholm Trail decision item scheduled for the September 2016 meeting may be delayed as it was dependant on the timing of the determination of the respective planning application.

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

7. CITY DEAL PROGRESS REPORT

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, presented the City Deal progress report, which the Joint Assembly **NOTED**.

8. MONITORING DELIVERY OF 1,000 EXTRA NEW HOMES ON RURAL EXCEPTION SITES

The Joint Assembly considered a report on the City Deal's commitment to the delivery of 1,000 new homes on rural exception sites. In particular, Members noted the approach to monitoring set out in paragraphs 11 to 23 inclusive, and the progress towards delivery set out in paragraph 18 of the report.

The Joint Assembly received and noted a letter from Councillor Bridget Smith, who was unable to attend the meeting.

South Cambridgeshire District Council's Planning Policy Manager summarised the report, and referred Assembly members to the graph attached thereto. She explained that the red line indicated the level of housing provision needed in order to meet delivery targets contained within the South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council Local Plans. Where the yearly bars extended above the red line, this indicated projected delivery of the 1,000 extra homes.

Councillor Maurice Leeke pointed to the different emphases that could be placed on the City Deal's commitment. He said that, in any event, it was important to focus on the words 'affordable' and 'additional'. The homes should be built on rural exception sites so that the 'local connection' requirement could be applied. Councillor Leeke said that the proposed definition of affordable housing, set out in paragraph 17 of the report, should be clear on that point. Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, expressed concern that strict adherence to the need for a local connection could lead to homes remaining vacant where no such local need existed, and until the 'cascading out' measures were implemented.

Alex Colyer, Executive Director at South Cambridgeshire District Council explained how the District Council prioritised entitlement to affordable housing.

Councillor Leeke suggested that the definition of affordable housing should draw a distinction between the commitment to provide 1,000 new homes, and the affordable homes delivered by virtue of developments permitted as a result of the inability to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. Councillor Kevin Price argued that the proposed definition of affordable housing, as set out in paragraph 17 of the report, was sufficient. There was further discussion about the different ways in which affordable housing could be delivered and unease at the apparent lack of consistency in applying 'local connection' criteria.

Sir Michael Marshall suggested that local support and local needs should be defining factors.

Councillor Price referred to the impact that viability could have on the target figure of 40% affordable housing on permitted housing developments. Caroline Hunt confirmed that the policy was one of 40% affordable housing, subject to viability.

Councillor Leeke said that exception sites resulted from the goodwill of landowners providing land that might otherwise one day have been included within development frameworks. Such landowners were thus foregoing the opportunity of benefiting from a substantial increase in land values. He said that one of the 'selling points' for landowners releasing land outside development frameworks was the attraction of the 'local connection' element. He said that this, in turn, could release affordable housing elsewhere, as people moved back to the villages of their birth.

It was proposed that the following sentence to be added to the definition of affordable housing contained in paragraph 17:

"...with due consideration given to the housing needs of local people."

Councillor Leeke agreed with this as a way of addressing his concerns. Mr Colyer requested that the concept of 'aspiration' be included so as to add clarity and limit expectation.

The Joint Assembly therefore:

- (a) **NOTED** progress towards delivery as set out in paragraph 18 of the report.
- (b) **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board:
 - 1. Treats as the same figure of 33,500, the housing supply (both through actual housing completions and through predicted completions from permissions, allocations and windfalls) required in the submitted Local Plans for Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, and the commitment in

the City Deal agreement;

2. Defines the City Deal agreement on affordable housing as follows:

"All affordable homes (as defined by the National Planning Policy Framework) constructed on rural exception sites, and on sites not allocated for development in the local plans and outside of a defined settlement boundary."

3. Requests that due consideration be given to the housing needs of local people;
4. Requires Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council to identify and record eligible planning permissions and completions, and the forecast and actual years in which they are built, as set out in Appendix 1 of the report (Figure 2), detailing also the cumulative total so that the delivery of the 1,000 additional homes can be identified.

9. CAMBRIDGE PROMOTIONS AGENCY UPDATE

Consideration was given to a report which provided an update on the progress and direction of the Cambridge Promotion Agency.

Claire Ruskin presented the report, further to which Councillor Kevin Cuffley raised concern regarding the impact of the result of the EU Referendum on investment in Cambridge. It was noted that, despite the result of the referendum, Cambridge businesses that exported internationally were doing well as a result of the weak pound sterling. Whilst there were businesses doing well, there were some businesses that were moving out of Cambridge or delaying investment in Cambridge. Despite this, Cambridge was still seen as a very positive place to invest and do business in.

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the report.

10. CITY DEAL RISK MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

Aaron Blowers, City Deal Project Manager, presented the City Deal Risk Management Framework. In response to questions from Joint Assembly Members, Mr Blowers explained that:

- the individual strategic risks would be covered in the next report;
- the economic growth benefits of particular schemes would be set out in their business cases;
- project-level risks, such as land purchase risk, would be managed at project level.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, questioned whether the Assembly needed to see the Strategic Risk Register quarterly, as recommended in the report. He felt that annually would be sufficient for the Joint Assembly, acknowledging that the Board may consider it quarterly.

Tanya Sherdian, City Deal Programme Director, said that the Joint Assembly could choose not to pre-scrutinise the risk register every quarter, but at a less frequent interval if preferred, with quarterly being recommended on the basis that this was current practice on risk reporting to the City Deal's partner Councils.

The Joint Assembly agreed that it should consider the Strategic Risk Register annually and that it would want to be informed of any red risks or risks that were rapidly increasing in severity through the progress reports item.

The Joint Assembly:

- (a) **RECOMMENDED** to the Executive Board that it approves the draft Risk Management Framework, to apply across the City Deal Programme.
- (b) **AGREED** that the Joint Assembly should receive reports on the City Deal strategic risk management on an annual basis and would otherwise want to consider risks only by exception (new red risks or significantly increased risks).

11. 2016/17 QUARTER 1 FINANCIAL MONITORING REPORT

The Joint Assembly considered a report which provided Members with the financial monitoring position for the period ending 31 July 2016.

It was noted that the variance in expenditure was due to timing. The narrative would be reviewed for the next report in order to provide more clarity.

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the report.

The Meeting ended at 4.45 p.m.
