



## GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL EXECUTIVE BOARD

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board held on  
Thursday, 18 June 2015 at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT:

### Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board:

John Bridge	Cambridge Chamber of Commerce
Councillor Steve Count	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Lewis Herbert	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Ray Manning	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Roger Taylor	University of Cambridge

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

Councillor Tim Bick	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Kevin Price	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Ian Bates	Cambridgeshire County Council
Claire Ruskin	Cambridge Network

### Officers/advisors

Alan Carter	Cambridge City Council
Antoinette Jackson	Cambridge City Council
Andrew Limb	Cambridge City Council
Aaron Blowers	Cambridgeshire County Council
Graham Hughes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Stuart Walmsley	Cambridgeshire County Council
Neil Darwin	Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership
Alex Colyer	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Graham Watts	South Cambridgeshire District Council

### 1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Councillor Lewis Herbert was **ELECTED** as Chairman of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board for the 2015/16 municipal year.

### 2. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

Councillor Ray Manning was **ELECTED** as Vice-Chairman of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board for the 2015/16 municipal year.

**3. CO-OPTION OF NOMINATIONS BY THE GREATER CAMBRIDGE GREATER PETERBOROUGH ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP AND THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE**

The following nominations for co-option onto the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board were **APPROVED**:

**Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership:**

John Bridge (Member)  
Mark Reeve (Substitute)

**University of Cambridge:**

Professor Jeremy Sanders (Member until 31 December 2015)  
Professor Nigel Slater (Member from 1 January 2016)  
Roger Taylor (Substitute)

The following nominations for co-option onto the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly were **APPROVED**:

**Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership:**

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

**University of Cambridge:**

Anne Constantine (Cambridge Regional College)  
Jane Ramsey (Cambridge University Hospitals)  
Helen Valentine (Anglia Ruskin University)

**4. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

An apology for absence was received from Professor Jeremy Sanders. Roger Taylor attended the meeting as his substitute.

**5. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 27 March 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

Councillor Simon Edwards also submitted his apologies for absence.

**6. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Roger Taylor, representing the University of Cambridge, in respect of the options set out in the report for item 9, declared that the University owned the freehold of the Madingley Road Park and Ride site and farmland in the areas of Madingley Mulch and Barton Road.

## 7. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

A number of questions were submitted from members of the public and local City and District Councillors, which all related to item 9 in respect of the A428/Madingley Road Corridor Scheme. Those questions asked, together with answers provided at the meeting, were noted as follows:

### **Question by Mal Schofield**

Mr Schofield questioned reference in the minutes of the Board's previous meeting on 27 March 2015 where it stated that the traffic and transport demands of Cambridge were "very unique". He asked the Board whether it agreed with this statement.

He added that perhaps the only sense that Cambridge was different was its chosen dependency upon bus based public transport. The present guided busway was unique in that in its form it was a rarity in urban transport infrastructure. He said that the Board could be minded instead to take the best from international 21st century urban transport developments and commission a modest study to shortlist the most appropriate for Cambridge growth needs to 2050. Mr Schofield also felt that the Board should commission, in parallel, a corridor and gateway capacity management study before any substantial investment was considered. He cited Liverpool as an example of good practice and a city where lessons could be learnt in respect of public bus infrastructure.

Graham Hughes, Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, said that all of the key radial routes, and some others, into Cambridge suffered congestion during the peak periods and this frustrated the ability for buses to access the City Centre quickly and efficiently. This in turn reduced the incentive for people to use buses. He therefore felt that there was no need for a study as suggested, as the problem was very clear. The key task would be to start delivering improvements as soon as possible.

In terms of technology used, Mr Hughes confirmed that this would be considered on a case by case basis.

Mr Hughes explained that Cambridge was very different to Liverpool, the latter being a large metropolitan area with a significantly higher population with well established infrastructure links in and around the city. He supported the statement that Cambridge was unique in terms of its character when considered alongside the rural nature of the area surrounding it, compared to large metropolitan cities such as Liverpool.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman, reminded those present that the City Deal would provide significant opportunities to the Greater Cambridge area, but that there were restraints. The first tranche of schemes reflected a five year plan which had to deliver specific objectives to ensure that further tranches of funding could be accessed by Government.

### **Question by Edward Leigh**

Mr Leigh felt that the Board had anticipated the conclusions of the consultation on Cambridge City access measures by commissioning only options based around new bus lanes or dedicated busways. He thought it had ignored or dismissed the possibility that direct measures, such as reducing parking capacity in the City Centre, could reduce congestion on city roads enough to allow buses to run to time on existing roads.

He asked the Board whether it would consider commissioning an option 1(d) for public consultation that comprised at least the following:

- 2.5m cycle lanes in both directions along Madingley Road, at least as far as the Park and Ride site;
- safe cycle and pedestrian crossing points at all junctions to permit easy and safe movement between sites north and south of Madingley Road;
- an upgraded cycle link to Madingley village;
- an extension of the Coton cycle path to Cambourne via Hardwick, Highfields and the proposed Bourn Airport development (if it went ahead).

Mr Leigh was aware of no good reasons not to commission such an option and was of the opinion that doing so would improve the breadth and quality of public debate. He added that the Cambridge Cycling Campaign had endorsed this approach.

Mr Hughes reiterated the point he made at the meeting of the Joint Assembly on 3 June 2015 that all of the schemes would build in high quality cycling and walking facilities. He said, however, that cycling and walking were not the total solution and it would be essential, therefore, that each of the corridors was provided with a bus, cycle and walking solution. He reminded Members of the Board that the City Deal was for the Greater Cambridge area and beyond and so it was essential that people making these longer journeys were provided with options which would need to be by bus. Mr Hughes was of the opinion that, essentially, the options set out in the report dealt with the suggestions Mr Leigh had put forward, as well as including bus access.

### **Question by Councillor Markus Gehring**

Markus Gehring spoke as a Cambridge City Councillor representing the Newnham Ward.

Councillor Gehring did not understand why option 1(c) had been included as part of the proposed consultation, which he did not think was viable, and asked the Board to take a step back and give further thought to options that were actually deliverable. He asked the following questions:

- before a meaningful discussion of options (even at the high-level planning stage) is possible, shouldn't the entire bus road all the way to the City Centre be available in outline?;
- what in the Board's definition is a 'bus road'?
- what consideration is given to other sustainable transport options, especially in the light of climate change?;
- why was the map for option 1(c) revised?;
- are compulsory purchases envisioned?;
- what was your methodology to estimate the costs for a new bridge across the M11?;
- could the Board still opt for option 1(c) even if the consultation reveals serious shortcomings of this option?;

- I was told that when the North West Cambridge development was approved that assurances were given that the rest of the green belt between the University West Cambridge Site and Barton Road would remain untouched. How can these assurances be kept if option 1(c) is chosen?

Mr Hughes responded by saying that all of the options presented were possible and, as noted at the Assembly meeting, these were only indicative at this stage to elicit broad views before a single scheme or hybrid was chosen. The process of undertaking a public consultation in this manner was the same as would be carried out for any other major transport infrastructure scheme.

The key definition of a bus road was a route that only buses could use. The details of whether it was guided and, if so, what form of guidance would come later depending on circumstances. The main point was that the infrastructure was provided for buses only and so complete free running for the buses was guaranteed, which was the key to providing reliability and journey time benefits. Mr Hughes explained that it was not the bus that made it good or bad environmentally, but the method of propulsion. Once a bus road was built, it would be able to take vehicles of any form of propulsion whether that be electric, hybrid, regenerative braking or diesel. Cycling and walking would be built into all of the scheme proposals.

It was noted that there had been a slight error in the presentation of the map for option 1(c), so it was considered prudent to amend this. Mr Hughes emphasised, however, that the maps were only indicative.

Mr Hughes explained that a normal schedule of rates was used to calculate the cost of the bridge, alongside benchmarks for similar forms of structure. However, as the whole scheme and location of any bridge at this stage was indicative, the costs were very indicative too.

Councillor Herbert stated that the consultation would generate responses, which would help identify and shape preferred options to address the A428 and Madingley Road Corridor. Those options would then be worked up for a second stage of public consultation.

### **Question by Councillor Rod Cantrill**

Rod Cantrill spoke as a Cambridge City Councillor representing the Newnham Ward.

Councillor Cantrill said that the discussion at the last Joint Assembly meeting highlighted the lack of detailed analysis undertaken on the possible options for the proposed bus route from the West into Cambridge. He felt that this was further emphasised by the comment from officers that the proposed Park and Ride at Madingley Mulch would not take place in parallel with the introduction of a bus route. He therefore asked the Board:

- to postpone the public consultation to allow for a more detailed analysis of the possible bus route options, setting out clearly the route each option would follow and to present the detailed analysis to the Board in October with a view to go out to public consultation at the end of the year;
- during this period for officers to meet with key stakeholders to get their input in to the current options proposed and any other route that could achieve the objectives of the scheme in a more efficient way;

- to establish what steps or funding would be required to move the Park and Ride to a new location in parallel with the introduction of the proposed bus route;
- to consider that the detailed analysis should include but not be limited to:
  - how the bus route would serve key employment areas to the north of the city and link into the science park station – all options in the report;
  - the impact of the route on existing cycle and pedestrian provision – options 1(a) and 1(b) in the report;
  - how the physical environment would change as a result of the route being introduced – all options in the report;
  - the viability of option 1(b), given the covenants that exist on the land surrounding the American cemetery;
  - whether a tidal bus lane system could be introduced – option 1(a) and 1(b) of the report;
  - the route of travel of the bus once it leaves the dedicated bus route as set out in option 1(c) – what steps do officers propose to remove traffic movements on the route to allow for a reliable service.

Councillor Cantrill, recognising that the City Deal was in its very early stages, was of the opinion that it had to win the confidence of residents and stakeholders in order to be credible for the Greater Cambridge area, as well as the wider region.

Mr Hughes reiterated that the options at this stage were only indicative. The reason for that was so that initial feedback could be given to guide decision making and further detailed scheme development. Given the cost of scheme development, it would not be possible to develop in detail each of the options set out in the report.

Mr Hughes said that the engagement mentioned in the question could be put forward as part of the consultation process, which was the point of carrying it out. He added that all of the detailed points noted in the question would be addressed as the scheme proposals were refined and developed.

### **Question by Stephen Coates**

Mr Coates asked the following question:

Given that option 1(c) would blight the Coton Corridor with a new access road across the Great West Field, countryside that is key for the setting of Cambridge and given that the High Court prevented the land North and South of Barton Road being developed for landscape reasons in 2008, how can the University of Cambridge now use its position as one of five members of the City Deal Executive to promote a route for consultation (especially with little detail) that will so severely damage this critical landscape and thereby assist a major development of potentially over 3,500 houses that could secure Cambridge University and partners gains in excess of £1 billion? Why has this conflict of interest and the conflict in option 1(c) passing the University's two key town centre development sites (Silver Street, New Museums) not been disclosed by Cambridge University and challenged and fully investigated by the City Deal Joint Assembly who should hold them accountable?

Roger Taylor, representing the University of Cambridge, said that the mission of the University of Cambridge was to contribute to society through the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence. In pursuing that mission it directly made major contributions to the economy, social fabric and culture of the Greater Cambridge area and it also attracted other vital employers and activities. The future success of the University and the City were closely aligned and one could not

flourish without the other. It was therefore appropriate that the University had a voice through the City Deal Executive Board.

He added that the location of the University's sites were public knowledge and it would declare any interests that it had in property or developments that were being discussed or considered by the Board. The City Deal was intended to encourage and enable the major stakeholders in and around the city to be involved in key discussions. The elected Members remained the decision makers and as a matter of law neither the Local Enterprise Partnership nor the University could have a vote on any of the Board's decisions.

Councillor Herbert reflected that the University would sometimes have conflicts of interest due to land that it owned and its holdings, but made the point that so to did other partners on the Executive Board and Joint Assembly. He added that he welcomed the University's contributions to the City Deal process.

Councillor Steve Count, Leader of Cambridgeshire County Council, reported that the University had played a key part in negotiating the City Deal with the Government and that the University had never promoted its own interests as part of being represented on the Executive Board.

Councillor Ray Manning, Leader of South Cambridgeshire District Council, said that without the help and advice of the University the City Deal would not have materialised for Greater Cambridge.

#### **Question by Stacey Weiser**

Stacey Weiser, on behalf of Cambridge Past, Present and Future, asked whether the Board would consider postponing the public consultation for a few months to allow time for the strengthening of the evidence base on the route options. She was of the view that the suspension of the examination of the Local Plans meant that there was some flexibility in the timescale to allow for the collection of necessary information.

Mr Hughes responded by saying that this was an early stage consultation and that no decisions on routes were yet being taken. As noted at the Joint Assembly meeting, if different, better or hybrid options emerged from this consultation, then they could be taken on board. He was of the view that to delay the consultation at this stage would not increase consensus and therefore simply delay the overall delivery. It was vital for the economic health of the Greater Cambridge area that the schemes proposed for the first tranche of the City Deal were developed as quickly as possible, with full public consultation. For that reason, Mr Hughes said that it was important that the process started now. He confirmed that it was also not possible to develop more details for all of the options at this stage of the process as that would be extremely expensive.

#### **Question by Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer**

Aidan Van de Weyer spoke as a South Cambridgeshire District Councillor.

Councillor Van de Weyer was supportive of public transport as a means of enabling sustainable transport around Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, particularly where routes consisted of segregation and no missing links. He asked what evidence the City Deal Executive Board had to make it believe that each of the three options for bus improvements along Madingley Road would bring the required benefits.

Councillor Van de Weyer also queried reference in the report to 'engagement with interested local Members' and sought clarity over what this entailed.

Mr Hughes said that there was much evidence nationally and internationally that journey time improvements and more importantly, reliability for public transport systems, would lead to increases in patronage. Journey times for buses on the A428 and Madingley Road Corridor were currently unreliable, unnecessarily long and offered no advantage over the private motor vehicle. If one of the proposed options proceeded, the intention was to address that issue. Each of the options had different levels of benefit in this respect, as discussed at the Joint Assembly meeting. Mr Hughes added that, generally, the higher impact options would ultimately have the greater benefits.

Mr Hughes reported that locally there was a very good example of how improvements in bus infrastructure could stimulate demands and thus achieve the proposed benefits. It was noted that the Busway now carried around 3.7 million passengers per year, above target. Many of those had not been using the bus before its introduction. The services were commercially operated and at the start of operation there were seven buses per hour from St Ives to Cambridge, whereas there were now 17. At peak hours buses were full and the frequency would be increased again soon. This demonstrated how improved infrastructure would drive passenger growth, reducing use of the private motor vehicle and thus achieving the City Deal objectives.

In terms of local Member engagement, it was proposed that this would be through Local Liaison Forums, which was usual practice for significant transport infrastructure schemes such as this and would ensure that local Members and key stakeholders were kept fully informed of developments as the scheme progressed.

The Chairman thanked members of the public and City and District Councillors for their questions.

## **8. REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE JOINT ASSEMBLY**

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that the Assembly had met on 3 June 2015. He submitted his report and recommendations from the Joint Assembly for each respective item on the agenda for this meeting, which it was agreed he would present at the relevant point of the meeting.

Councillor Bick took this opportunity to say that the Joint Assembly was trying very hard to make constructive contributions to the City Deal's work, which he hoped the Executive Board would take into account.

## **9. A428/A1303 MADINGLEY ROAD CORRIDOR SCHEME OPTIONS AND APPROVAL TO CONSULT**

Consideration was given to 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.



Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, provided the Board with a report following consideration of this issue at the meeting of the Assembly held on 3 June 2015. He reported that the Assembly had received questions from nine members of the public about this proposed scheme indicating points of view which, though answered at the meeting, represented a number of themes of which Assembly Members felt should be highlighted to the Board as follows:

- the funding of tranches 2 and 3 of the City Deal could be critical in enabling the Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans, given that it would make a key contribution to the sustainability of new and enlarged settlements detached from the city, about which the Planning Inspector had expressed concern;
- consultation on the scheme could be premature, as the sustainability of the new and expanded settlements such as those envisaged along the A428 corridor appeared to have been challenged by the Planning Inspectors examining the two Local Plans. It was the Assembly's view that no inconsistency arose in relation to the kind of improvement represented by option 1 because it was needed even in current conditions. Greater clarity about the Local Plans was likely to be available before a decision was made about the funding improvements represented by options 2 as the funding had been deferred to tranche two of the programme.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, responded to these two points which he summarised as being the securing of funding for further tranches of the City Deal and the interrelationship between the City Deal and the City and District Councils' Local Plans. He was of the view that the Board had made its decision around the programme for tranche one of the funding believing the schemes within it to be deliverable that would meet the necessary objectives. If the funding from tranches two or three did not materialise, the partner Councils would be required to fund schemes themselves. Councillor Herbert reminded the Board, therefore, that it fell on partners to ensure delivery of these immediate schemes within the tranche one programme.

In respect of the Local Plans, Councillor Herbert said that the Inspectors had suspended the examination to request that the two Councils provide more information on housing numbers, sustainability and the balancing of development on the edge of the city and how that impacted on the evidence base. In terms of the impact of the City Deal on the Local Plans, he indicated that if no transport solutions were in place then this itself would raise a question of unsustainability, which was why the principle of addressing the A428 and Madingley Road Corridor was so important.

Councillor Bick reported that the Joint Assembly's consideration and discussion echoed a number of the points raised in the public statements about the strengths and weaknesses of particular options, but it was the Joint Assembly's overwhelming view that all options should go forward for consultation to enable public input before further filtering was undertaken. He added that, as the City Deal presented a rare opportunity to make a significant investment in this area which it was hoped would deliver an enduring benefit, it was important to ensure that bold options were included for evaluation. The Joint Assembly therefore made a number of recommendations as set out below.

The Joint Assembly recommended that the Executive Board 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.

The Executive Board supported this recommendation.

Councillor Bick explained that the Assembly noted requests for greater clarity about the detail of the options. However, it was understood from officers that the proposed initial consultation was to enable the selection of a concept and that further investment of resources in detailed design work would not be undertaken until a concept had been selected, at which stage a further waive of consultation would be undertaken. Accordingly, the options currently proposed for consultation were regarded as representative of the means by which better priority for bus transport could be secured, in order to stimulate public input which could include suggested hybrids or further alternatives of the options presented. The Assembly sought the Board's endorsement of this understanding and felt that emphasis should be made in the consultation exercise to ensure that this context was fully explained to the public.

Councillor Herbert confirmed that this approach would be followed.

Councillor Bick reported that, in making an exception to the above, the Assembly agreed two recommendations to the Board in relation to the location of a new Park and Ride site near to the Madingley Mulch roundabout and the future of the existing Madingley Road park and ride site, as follows:

That the Assembly recommends to the Executive Board that the public consultation should:

- (i) include a question asking about 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.

In relation to (i) above, the Assembly also discussed the possibility of better indicating the conceptual status of a new Park and Ride site at Madingley Mulch by not marking out on a map a specific site or sites. With regards to (ii) above, the Assembly discussed the possibility of satisfying its recommendation by simply explaining the assumption at this stage of retaining the existing Madingley Road Park and Ride site.

Graham Hughes, Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, reported that, since the meeting of the Joint Assembly, officers had reflected on the Assembly's proposal and now recommended its inclusion as part of the consultation.

The Executive Board supported recommendations (i) and (ii), as above.

Councillor Bick reported that the Assembly discussed the relationship of the proposed online and offline busway options to cycling provision. It was understood at the meeting of the Assembly that cycling and pedestrian provision would be made in the case of each option and its scope in each case would be indicated as part of the consultation process. The Joint Assembly sought the Board's agreement to this approach.

The Executive Board supported this approach.

The Assembly also identified in its discussions that reliability was as important as journey time for the choices people made about mode of transport. As the approach underlying the City Deal investments was to encourage modal shift to public transport, officers agreed to ensure that this was adequately reflected as a variable against each of the options going into consultation. The Joint Assembly sought the Board's agreement to this approach.

Councillor Steve Count, Leader of Cambridgeshire County Council, made the point that reliability and journey time were both very important considerations. The Executive Board therefore supported the approach proposed by the Joint Assembly, subject to making it clear that reliability and journey time were both very important considerations.

The Assembly also discussed the overall project timetable incorporated in the report and, noting its length, wished to pressure-test it to see if it could be accelerated. The Assembly therefore recommended that officers should be instructed 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 to consider.

Councillor Herbert agreed that officers should be asked to investigate the potential of a more aspirational timetable in terms of the scheme completion date.

Mr Hughes indicated that he would review the timetable, but highlighted the stages of the process that needed to be followed with a scheme as significant as this, including the timeframe necessary to allow for public consultation. He emphasised that this was already a challenging programme as it stood and did not want expectations to be raised.

Councillor Count made reference to the imminent appointment of the City Deal Director who he felt should be responsible for ensuring that the delivery of schemes was in accordance with agreed timescales and that the Board should be informed as early as possible should delivery dates for each stage of a scheme not be reached.

In relation to the process of developing detailed designs following the initial public consultation, the Assembly recommended 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.

John Bridge, Chairman of the Cambridge Chamber of Commerce, felt that the establishment of a Local Liaison Forum would create an additional layer of unhelpful bureaucracy, considering there was a Joint Assembly in place already and that there would be two public consultations carried out on the scheme.

Mr Hughes explained that, in his experience of managing major transport infrastructure schemes, it was extremely useful to have liaison in this format with local Members and other key stakeholders. It ensured that information was shared regularly and helped identify issues or problems at an early stage, assisting with the delivery of schemes in accordance with set timescales. He made it clear that these Liaison Forums would not be decision-making bodies and would only be in place to facilitate an exchange of information at a local level.

Councillor Ray Manning, Leader of South Cambridgeshire District Council, agreed with Mr Bridge and was deeply concerned that the establishment of a Local Liaison Forum would actually cause the project to slip behind schedule because of additional bureaucracy.

It was agreed that officers be asked to provide more detailed information on the role, remit and makeup of the Local Liaison Forum.

John Bridge and Councillor Ray Manning requested that it be recorded in the minutes that they did not support the establishment of a Local Liaison Forum.

The Assembly considered a number of other matters tangential to the launch of consultation on improvements to the A428 and Madingley Road Corridor Scheme and recommended 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.

The Executive Board supported this recommendation, in principle.

The Joint Assembly recommended 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 sliproads:

- (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 sliproad, then going round the corner of the farmland at Trumpington Meadows, running parallel to (as west of) Trumpington Road, and entering the Trumpington Road Park and Ride thence joining up to the Guided Busway.

It was noted that this would be a very high-level piece of work, which could be reported to the October cycle of meetings, and that it would be separate to the A428 and Madingley Road Corridor Scheme.

Councillor Count was concerned that this piece of work was being considered at this stage when it had not been evaluated amongst other schemes that were initially considered as part of the tranche one programme.

The Executive Board agreed that this was a significant part of the corridor and, in view of the high-level nature of the piece of work, supported the recommendation.

Discussion ensued on the consultation process itself, in terms of where it would be advertised and how far-reaching it would be in terms of those people asked to provide a response, accepting that the A428 and Madingley Road Corridor impacted people living outside of the Greater Cambridge area. Mr Hughes reassured the Board that the consultation would be advertised on the County Council's website in the usual way that all other major transport infrastructure schemes were. Councillor Herbert made it clear that the consultation would be open to anyone.

It was suggested that responses to the consultation should be published online, enabling people to view responses that had already been received before making a submission themselves. The Board asked officers to investigate this approach and it was noted that this would only be able to occur for those responses that had been submitted electronically via the County Council's consultation website.

The Chairman summarised that the Executive Board:

- (1) **NOTED** the findings from the initial engineering assessment and technical study.
- (2) **APPROVED** the public consultation on the options set out in the report.
- (3) **AGREED** to receive a report on consultation later this year on a preferred option, or options, for full business case development.
- (4) **AGREED** that the public consultation should:
  - (i) include a question asking about the public's views of the optimum location for the new Park and Ride at Maddingley Mulch;
  - (ii) contain a discussion or analysis of the benefits/disadvantages of retaining/closing the existing Maddingley Road Park and Ride site.
- (5) **AGREED** that cycling and pedestrian provision would be made in the case of each option and its scope in each case would be included as part of the consultation process.
- (6) **AGREED**, in support of the Joint Assembly's comments regarding the encouragement of modal shift, that reliability and journey time were both very important considerations.
- (7) **AGREED** to ask officers to investigate the possibility of uploading responses to the consultation onto the County Council's website, in order that they could be viewed online during the consultation process.
- (8) **AGREED** to ask officers to review the timetable set out in the report with a view to being more aspirational with regard to the scheme completion date, also ensuring that the Board received early notification of minimum delivery dates for each stage not being reached.
- (9) **AGREED** to ask officers to provide more detailed information on the role, remit and makeup of the Local Liaison Forum proposed to be established to exchange information and ideas on the project with local County, City and District Members, parish representatives and other key stakeholders.
- (10) **AGREED**, in principle, that Cambridge University (as freeholder of the existing Maddingley Road Park and Ride site) should be encouraged 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 reflected the aims and aspirations of the Greater Cambridge City Deal) if the Park and Ride facility was closed in the context of the opening of a new site at Maddingley Mulch and if the existing site was to revert back to the University.

- (11) **AGREED** to instruct officers to submit a report to the October 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 at:
- (i) the M11 junction 13: when turning off the A1303 (going east) onto the M11 (going south);
  - (ii) 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) the M11 junction 11: turning off the M11 (going south) between the existing farm and footbridge and the existing sliproad, 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.

## 10. **PROPOSAL FOR CONSULTING ON CAMBRIDGE CITY CENTRE ACCESS MEASURES**

The Executive Board considered a report which outlined proposals to develop a strategy for addressing the congestion that occurred regularly in Cambridge City.

Graham Hughes, Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report and reminded Members 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.

An initial consultation to develop a strategy to address this issue was agreed at the Board's last meeting, following which officers had been looking at development of the strategy options and 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.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that the Assembly considered this report at its meeting on 3 June 2015. Members of the Assembly welcomed the report and supported the recommendations contained within it.

The Executive Board:

- (1) **APPROVED** the process for developing the strategy to address congestion issues in Cambridge City.
- (2) **APPROVED** the development plans for an initial engagement exercise with key traffic generators in Cambridge City followed by a public consultation.

## 11. **BUSINESS CASE FOR THE FORMATION OF THE GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AGENCY**

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

Alex Colyer, Executive Director (Corporate Services) from South Cambridgeshire District Council, presented the report and informed the Board that the business case had been submitted to this body for consideration ahead of the three partner Councils as agreed at the previous meeting.

Alan Carter, Head of Strategic Housing at Cambridge City Council, reminded the Board that the essential requirements for an organisation to successfully develop housing were land (subject to planning approval), 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.

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.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that the Assembly at its meeting on 3 June 2015 welcomed this report.

John Bridge, Chairman of the Cambridge Chamber of Commerce, questioned the phasing of recruitment for the Housing Development Agency in terms of the appointment of the Managing Director, which he felt should be done earlier in the process. Mr Colyer reported that a senior person should be appointed to lead the Agency earlier than originally anticipated.

Members of the Board expressed their support for the business case, acknowledging the importance of this aspect of the City Deal.

The Executive Board **NOTED** the report and welcomed the business case.

## 12. SKILLS

The Executive Board considered a report 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 an integrator 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.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, provided an update following consideration of this report at the meeting of the Assembly held on 3 June 2015. He reported that Members welcomed the report, supporting its recommendations, and proposed that a Cambridge Area Partnership Secondary Head Teacher be co-opted onto the Working Group. John Bridge, Chairman of the Cambridge Chamber of Commerce, suggested that the current Chairman of the Cambridge Area Partnership would be an appropriate appointment.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, sought clarity over the figures set out in the report and asked whether this would be sufficient for the Skills Service to operate effectively. Mr Hughes confirmed that the funding set out in the report would enable the Skills Service to deliver what it had been set up to achieve.

The Executive Board **AGREED**:

- (1) To adopt the model of the Skills Service and its governance described in the report.
- (2) To request that officers establish it so that it can start work at the beginning of the next academic year (September 2015).
- (3) That a Cambridge Area Partnership Secondary Head Teacher be co-opted onto the Working Group, with the current Chairman of the Cambridge Area Partnership being the Executive Board's suggested nominee.

## 13. GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL WORK PROGRAMME AND SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS

The Executive Board noted the City Deal work programme and agreed to cancel its meeting scheduled to be held on 9 September 2015. Future meetings were therefore confirmed as follows:

- 4 August 2015 – 2pm (Cambourne)
- 1 October 2015 – 2pm (Cambridge)
- 3 November 2015 – 2pm (Cambridge)
- 3 December 2015 – 2pm (Cambourne)



---

**The Meeting ended at 4.35 p.m.**

---