



GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL EXECUTIVE BOARD

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board held on
Friday, 27 March 2015 at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board:

Councillor Lewis Herbert	Cambridge City Council (Chairman)
Councillor Ray Manning	South Cambridgeshire District Council (Vice-Chairman)
John Bridge	Cambridge Chamber of Commerce
Councillor Steve Count	Cambridgeshire County Council
Professor Jeremy Sanders	University of Cambridge

Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly in attendance:

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

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
Mark Lloyd	Cambridgeshire County Council
Chris Malyon	Cambridgeshire County Council
Alex Colyer	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Jean Hunter	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Graham Watts	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Neil Darwin	Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations were made.

3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board held on 28 January 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Questions were asked and answered as follows:

Question by Susan van de Ven

Susan van de Ven spoke as the County Councillor for Melbourn, Foxton, Shepreth and Meldreth, which made up a large chunk of the Cambridge to Royston corridor and part of an intensely interconnected cluster of employment centres and residential areas.

Councillor van de Ven also chaired the A10 Corridor Cycling Campaign, whose members lived between Royston and Cambridge and worked at places such as Melbourn Science Park, Johnson Matthey and Cambridge colleges and universities. The Board was presented with two letters, as follows:

- a letter signed by more than 100 employers, outlining the high value placed on a prospective A10 cycle network as a means of travelling to work. Councillor van de Ven stated that cycling distances were modest and achievable, car parking spaces were running out and congestion rendered peak car journey times unreliable;
- a letter signed by all eleven partners of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, asking for completion of the A10 corridor cycle network at the earliest opportunity.

Councillor van de Ven stated that, in 2013, Cambridge with a resident population of 125,000 people saw 190,000 vehicles driving in and out of the city every day. She added that the situation today saw gridlock on the A10 approach to Cambridge being increasingly frequent. She added that more of the Biomedical Campus and new housing developments south of the city were yet to be built and there were no plans to dual the A10 from Royston. Councillor van de Ven highlighted that an A10 cycle route had been identified as a potential City Deal scheme as it would ease traffic congestion for those people currently relying upon using public transport or private vehicles.

Councillor van de Ven said that the City Deal was built around the principle of unlocking further funding and making sure that schemes were delivered in full, not in unfinished segments. She welcomed the news that the Cycling Ambition Grant would address the route between Foxton and Cambridge, but was concerned that the southern half of the corridor was unfunded. In her opinion this was a highly deliverable scheme, with landownership issues resolved, path design completed and local consultation on details carried out.

As the local County Councillor, she asked whether the Executive Board was confident that it was taking into account the views of the business community when making decisions about City Deal funding.

Mr Hughes reported that additional funding had been secured for the A10, totalling £2 million, which was in progress when the Board made its decision on prioritised infrastructure schemes in January 2015 and would be used to complete a significant part of the route. In terms of the remaining elements of the original £7 million City Deal proposed funding for the A10 cycle corridor scheme, this would have covered links to surrounding villages, the completion of the route from Melbourn south to the A505 and a bridge over the A505. Mr Hughes stated that the Executive Board would need to decide how it wanted to take this forward, as the remaining part of the project could be delivered as part of the City Deal infrastructure programme or via alternative sources of funding. He added that completion of the route just along the A10 without the links to surrounding villages and the bridge over the A505 could be completed for approximately £500,000.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the City Deal Executive Board, welcomed the funding that had already been received for the A10 cycling project from the Cycling Ambition Grant and encouraged the use of other additional funding opportunities towards delivering schemes such as this.

Councillor Steve Count, Leader of Cambridgeshire County Council, accepted that schemes such as this could be delivered relatively quickly, but he was concerned about adding this particular scheme to the programme at this stage ahead of other schemes that had gone under scrutiny. In view of the fact that other funding sources could potentially be identified, he did not support this scheme being paid for out of the City Deal budget at this time. With regard to the question about taking into account the views of the business community, Councillor Count reminded Councillor van de Ven that three representatives of the business community sat on the Joint Assembly, with a representative also sitting on this Executive Board.

John Bridge, Chairman of the Cambridge Chamber of Commerce, reported that an extensive consultation with businesses had recently been undertaken, the results of which suggested that increased cycleway provision was not a very high priority and that it was not seen as a major contributor to the area's economic benefit. Mr Bridge supported the perusal of other funding streams for the delivery of this scheme.

Professor Jeremy Sanders, Pro-Vice-Chancellor at the University of Cambridge, was of the opinion that it seemed easier to secure additional funds from other sources for smaller projects, such as this cycleway scheme. He therefore supported the approach that the larger, more expensive schemes should be paid for out of the City Deal budget.

Question by Jim Chisholm

Mr Chisholm made the following points in presenting his question:

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

Mr Chisholm asked how the Board could be made more aware of this and similar evidence.

Graham Hughes, Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, informed Mr Chisholm that he and other City Deal partner organisations regularly received the statistics that he had quoted. This and similar information was already used by officers to justify recommendations made to the Executive Board.

Councillor Lewis Herbert stated that this analysis would be used when considering infrastructure schemes later in the year, including the provision of cycling. He added that employers and their destinations attracted a lot of congestion and said that discussions with major employers should be held to establish what provision they planned to make for cyclists.

Question by Paul Hollinghurst

Mr Hollinghurst referred to the prioritised infrastructure schemes for the City Deal and the fact that they included a number of bus priority measures. As a city resident commuting regularly by bus, he had a particular interest in this and had experienced first-hand how unreliable the existing services were. Mr Hollinghurst also stated that the bus priority schemes promised to ensure that bus journeys were direct and unaffected by congestion caused by general traffic on the corridor, which he felt was a strong statement.

He referred to an economic prioritisation study recently carried out in respect of the impact of bus schemes on housing and employment and cited a further study undertaken by Liverpool of its 26 bus lanes, which found that 22 of them were of little or no use as they made traffic flow at junctions worse and cancelled out any benefits. Mr Hollinghurst was of the view that great care therefore needed to be given when adding more bus lanes to Cambridge's network. In contrast, he put forward Zurich as an example of a city that had successfully freed up its city centre by regulating the rate cars flowed into the central area to ensure that the roads remained free running, meaning that buses could share roads with other traffic but without delays.

Mr Hollinghurst highlighted that Park and Ride facilities featured strongly in the City Deal infrastructure schemes, but was concerned that these would increase traffic in the region of the Park and Ride sites and could undermine the conventional bus network. He suggested a better approach of providing parking and cycling access along existing bus and rail routes. He also made reference to the rail network and felt that enhancing ease of access to the rail network and integrated multi-mode ticketing should be a strong City Deal objective.

In closing, Mr Hollinghurst asked how the Board could be sure that the priority infrastructure schemes were going to work, whether they could guarantee congestion free journeys and whether they were the best way of freeing buses from congestion. He also sought views on the examples of Liverpool and Zurich, and asked whether more Park and Ride facilities were appropriate or if enhancement of the conventional bus and rail networks were a better approach.

Mr Hughes responded by acknowledging the examples of Liverpool and Zurich, stating that it was always very helpful to look at other areas and learn from their good practice. However, he reminded Mr Hollinghurst and the Board that Cambridge was very unique which made comparisons to cities such as Liverpool and Zurich that were so different in character very difficult. Mr Hughes said that City Deal partners as part of the commitment to the City Deal were equally looking at a solution for Cambridge, adding that the Deal currently aimed to create free flowing public transport as much as possible. He pointed out, however, that the City Deal could not guarantee a fully free flowing network and that it would be initially focussing on radial routes into the city centre. Mr Hughes was of the view that Mr Hollinghurst's points were all very valid, but that they had to be applied to the situation in Cambridge.

In terms of Park and Ride provision, Mr Hughes acknowledged that a significant issue to consider was whether to move sites further out of the city, as had already occurred with Milton. When originally designed the current Park and Ride sites were located out of the

city centre, but development on the edge of the city had now changed that. The very dispersed nature of Cambridge's surrounding villages meant that a traditional bus service of collecting people on the way into the city was very difficult to achieve from a service delivery and commercial point of view. It was Mr Hughes' view that the Park and Ride provision worked well for Cambridge and its surrounding villages.

Councillor Herbert highlighted that public consultation on each project would take place and encouraged Mr Hollinghurst to contribute, including on the need to change people's behaviour in order to address congestion. He also informed Mr Hollinghurst that City Deal partners would be in dialogue with bus service providers as part of proposals going forward.

5. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE JOINT ASSEMBLY

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the City Deal Joint Assembly, submitted his report and the Joint Assembly's recommendations following its meeting held on 6 March 2015.

Board Members **NOTED** the report and the Chairman of the Executive Board invited Councillor Bick to present the Joint Assembly's views and recommendations as part of each respective item at this meeting.

6. PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL HOUSING DEVELOPMENT VEHICLE

The Executive Board considered a report which set out a proposal to establish a Greater Cambridge City Deal Housing Development Vehicle.

Alex Colyer, South Cambridgeshire District Council's Executive Director (Corporate Services), presented the report which outlined how the proposed Housing Development Vehicle would deliver the City Deal's commitment to deliver an additional 1,000 dwellings on exception sites by 2031. He explained that the establishment of a Housing Development Vehicle would enable the effective and efficient delivery of various new build programmes associated with the City Deal, including:

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

Included as part of the proposal was the cost of funding a team for the first two years, with the Housing Development Vehicle subsequently operating on a self-funded basis. Without investing in this Vehicle it would take much longer for each respective Council to deliver the City Deal's housing development objectives. The proposal sought to bring together expertise but it was emphasised that it would not take anything away from each Council in respect of their own governance arrangements and development programmes. It was also noted that the Housing Development Vehicle was about the facilitation of development and would therefore not be an asset holding.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the City Deal Joint Assembly, presented the outcomes of the Assembly's consideration of this proposal following its meeting held on 6 March 2015. He reported that the Joint Assembly recommended that the Board approved the initial investment, but to do so only in principle at this stage to allow appropriate Member

involvement within the three partner Councils and scrutiny by the Assembly of the detailed business case and proposed staffing structure.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, confirmed that there would be a further opportunity for the three partner Councils and the Joint Assembly to consider the details relating to this proposal.

In discussing the Housing Development Vehicle proposal, the Board welcomed the opportunity to enter into this joint arrangement and:

- (a) **APPROVED** funding of £200,000 in 2015/16 and £200,000 in 2016/17 to support the establishment of a City Deal Housing Development Vehicle.
- (b) **REQUESTED** a report to the June cycle of meetings of the Joint Assembly and Executive Board, setting out the detailed business case for the proposed City Deal Housing Development Vehicle prior to consideration by the three partner Councils for decision.

7. **GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL PARTNERSHIP BUDGET**

NOTE – this item was considered after the item on the Greater Cambridge City Deal skills proposals.

Consideration was given to a report which sought approval of a budget for non-project costs for the 2015/16 financial year.

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

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the City Deal Joint Assembly, presented the outcomes of the Assembly's consideration of this proposal following its meeting held on 6 March 2015. In terms of the proposal to appoint a Programme Director for the City Deal, the Assembly urged the Board to give careful consideration around the person specification for this post to ensure that the right person was appointed to lead this significant piece of work. Members of the Assembly were also keen to clarify that the new posts of Programme Director and Project Manager, together with the new post associated with strategic communications, would be available to support the work of the Joint Assembly as well as the Executive Board.

Councillor Bick referred to the section on inward investment, highlighting that the advantage of the proposed scheme was that it was supported with effort and funding from the private sector and had the opportunity to become a self-sustaining model. In view of this, and in respect of the other budget proposals, the Joint Assembly supported the recommendations set out within the report.

In considering each section of the report, the following points were noted by Members of the Executive Board:

Central leadership and co-ordinating functions

In reference to the provision of £150,000 to allow for the recruitment of a Programme Director, a Project Manager and associated on costs, a question was raised as to the likelihood of attracting suitable candidates for posts that were fixed for two years, as suggested within the report. Mr Malyon was of the view that both posts would be extremely attractive due to the unique nature of the City Deal and clarified that they would not be advertised as two year posts. The two year reference related to the allocation of funding to support the two posts, which was initially set out in the budget for a two year period at this stage.

Strategic Communications

It was noted that specific projects would have communications activity attached to them, the cost of which had already been factored into the cost of delivering schemes. The additional resources proposed in the report would be used to support overarching communication around the City Deal as a programme.

Board Members highlighted the need for communication and key messages around the City Deal to be co-ordinated.

Smart Greater Cambridge

It was noted that a recent workshop had been held on this issue and the proposed £20,000 per year for two years would be used to lever other funding opportunities to support smart and digital initiatives for Greater Cambridge.

Members of the Board felt that more than £20,000 per year for two years should be made available in the future should it be required to attract further external funding to support the smart and digital agenda.

Inward investment and account management

Councillor Lewis Herbert supported the proposal set out in the report with regard to inward investment, subject to the following conditions:

- that a Service Level Agreement was in place;
- that there was clarity over the role, including a job description, and details of the outputs from the investment;
- a commitment that Cambridge Ahead and Cambridge Network would work together effectively on the project.

During discussion it was emphasised that the Greater Cambridge City Deal should benefit the Greater Cambridge area and not solely Cambridge City.

The Executive Board:

(a) **AGREED** that the following options in relation to the functions set out in the report be adopted and that budgetary provision be made within the 2015/16 Greater Cambridge City Deal non-project costs budget for:

- central coordinating functions in the sum of £150,000 per year for two years;
- strategic communications in the sum of £60,000 for two years;
- economic assessments in the sum of £10,000 per year for two years;

- Smart City in the sum of £20,000 per year for two years;
 - inward investment team to a maximum sum of £150,000, subject to the conditions set out in that section of the report and subject to:
 - entering into a Service Level Agreement;
 - clarity of the role, including a job description, and details of the outputs from the investment;
 - a commitment that Cambridge Ahead and Cambridge Network would work together effectively.
 - support for the delivery of additional housing in the sum of £200,000 per year for two years;
 - support for the delivery of the Skills Service, subject to satisfactory agreement of the model at the June cycle of meetings of the Joint Assembly and Executive Board, in the sum of £150,000 per year.
- (b) **APPROVED** the City Deal budget for non-project costs as set out in section 6 of the report for the financial year commencing 1 April 2015.
- (c) **RETAINED** the unutilised funding, as set out in section 8 of the report, for other needs that are expected to arise to progress the City Deal objectives, including potential investment in infrastructure schemes, and **AGREED** that this be carried forward at the year-end subject to any further demands that may be agreed by the Board within the financial year.
- (d) **AGREED** that these allocations be reviewed at the mid-year point and any amendments to these sums or additional elements be made at that point.

8. **PROPOSALS FOR DEVELOPING THE NEXT STAGES OF THE GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL TRANSPORT PROGRAMME AND CITY CENTRE CONGESTION**

The Executive Board gave consideration to a report which outlined the proposed process for developing the transport programme for the next steps of the City Deal. It also sought to identify how the Cambridge congestion issues would be dealt with in the context of the wider transport strategy for the Greater Cambridge area.

Developing the next stages of the City Deal Transport programme

Graham Hughes, Cambridgeshire County Council's Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment, presented the report which reminded Board Members of the process that had been followed for tranche one of the City Deal programme as agreed at the meeting of the Board on 28 January 2015. Within that prioritised programme was an allocation for programme development in years six to ten, recognising the importance of working up detail around the schemes to be delivered from 2020 onwards as well.

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

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the City Deal Joint Assembly, presented the outcomes of the Assembly's consideration of this aspect of the report following its meeting held on 6 March 2015. He asked the Board to note the following points:

- the Assembly accepted the proposed early process to reconsider schemes not included as part of the tranche one prioritised list, however, it was given assurance that these schemes would not in principle have precedence over new schemes which could emerge from subsequent deliberations and may add greater value to the City Deal objectives;
- the Assembly requested that the report on tranche two schemes scheduled for the Autumn should include all known and forecast funding streams available to transport investment relevant to the City Deal objectives.

Councillor Bick also reported that a number of representations had been received expressing concern about the future of the three rural cycling schemes which had not been included in the tranche one prioritisation process. The Assembly therefore approved the following proposal:

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

The following points by Board Members were noted:

- the schemes in the tranche two priority list should not be listed in such a way that one scheme was seen as having more priority than another scheme;
- the tranche two programme had to be agile;
- the important aspects of the tranche one and tranche two programmes was the inclusion of pipeline schemes and congestion reduction schemes;
- the schemes for tranche two coming before the Assembly and Board in June would have to be high level and would only be concepts, similar to those that were presented as part of the tranche one prioritisation process;
- soft measures and behavioural change were also important factors.

Considering the proposal approved by the Joint Assembly in respect of cycling schemes, the Executive Board did not support their re-introduction as reserve projects in view of the fact that other funding sources may be available to deliver them and that the issue could also be considered again as part of the programme review for the first five years. It was also acknowledged that they would be reconsidered as part of the tranche two prioritisation exercise should additional external resources not have been identified.

City centre congestion

Graham Hughes outlined that a significant package of £22.6 million had been allocated towards city centre capacity improvements as part of the tranche one prioritisation process. The partner Councils had commissioned consultants to undertake works to look

at a wide range of measures to free up movement within Cambridge and connect with other schemes being delivered through the City Deal. Officers had suggested themes for further exploration that could be categorised as follows:

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

Mr Hughes reported that a high level analysis of this work on these four themes could be available for reporting to the June cycle of Joint Assembly and Executive Board meetings.

Councillor Tim Bick reported that the Joint Assembly agreed that this was one of the most challenging aspects of the City Deal transport vision and would require innovative and radical thinking. To ensure the highest level of contribution and most balanced responses, the Assembly suggested that the Board ensured that any stage in public engagement was not confined to the summer period when a lot of the population, including much of the large academic community, was not resident.

Members of the Board supported the Assembly's comments in respect of public consultation and public engagement in respect of city centre schemes.

The Executive Board:

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

9. GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL SKILLS PROPOSALS

NOTE – this item was considered prior to the item on the Greater Cambridge City Deal partnership budget.

The Executive Board considered a report which outlined the potential means by which the skills element of the City Deal could be achieved and how it could contribute towards the objective of creating an additional 420 apprenticeships over five years and increasing the skill levels of the local workforce.

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

Mr Hughes reported that the skills element of the City Deal had been agreed through negotiations with the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, which included a Skills Service model to bridge the gap between employer needs and aspirations of learners. He indicated that young people in Cambridgeshire were making choices about their development, further education and future careers that could not necessarily be supported by the local economy in terms of potential employment opportunities.

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

- visit schools and colleges and work with their internal careers services and young people to explain what opportunities there were in the area in terms of training and employment;
- work with businesses to understand their needs and relay this back to young people and training providers, both in terms of needs currently and needs in the future;
- connect with training providers to assist in developing and providing appropriate courses to meet the needs of local businesses;
- undertake research into current and future needs;
- market the opportunities available in terms of apprenticeships.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, presented the outcomes of the Assembly's consideration of the proposals set out in the report at its meeting held on 6 March 2015. He reported that the Assembly noted the strengths of current provision but also recognised that there were systemic weaknesses. Members acknowledged the positive contributions made to aspects of this work by a variety of bodies, although there was general concern that the scale of the proposals seemed quite modest. The Assembly noted that this was a complex field with numerous active players, as well as more passive players, whose interests and perspectives all needed to be considered to achieve the right method of implementation and level of resourcing. Councillor Bick also made the point that there needed to be much more alignment between what young people wanted to do, the provision in place by training institutions and the needs of the local economy. The Joint Assembly therefore recommended that the Executive Board:

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

The Board supported the establishment of an informal group, as recommended, subject to the inclusion of representatives from the Local Enterprise Partnership, the Cambridge Area Partnership and this Executive Board.

Members of the Board also supported recommendation (a), subject to the deletion of the word 'model' in the first sentence to reflect the fact that it would be a Skills Service taking this work forward.

The Executive Board therefore:

- (a) **APPROVED** the principle of the Skills Service as the basis for the achievement of the City Deal objective on skills and **REQUESTED** a further report containing the detailed proposals for the Skills Service for submission to the June meetings of the Joint Assembly and Executive Board.
- (b) **AGREED** to establish an informal group of Joint Assembly Members together with representatives of the Local Enterprise Partnership, the Cambridge Area Partnership and the City Deal Executive Board, to meet and work with officers, key partners and stakeholders, that will feed into the report for submission to the June meetings of the Joint Assembly and the Executive Board.
- (c) **ALLOCATED** net budgetary provision of £125,000 per annum for delivery of the Skills Service, subject to satisfactory agreement of the model at the June cycle of meetings of the Joint Assembly and Executive Board.

10. WORK PROGRAMME

The Executive Board **AGREED** its work programme for 2015.

The Meeting ended at 4.05 p.m.
