



GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP

Growing and sharing prosperity

Delivering our City Deal

GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP JOINT ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly
held on Thursday 2 November 2017 at 2.00pm

PRESENT:

Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly:

Councillor Kevin Price (Chairman)	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Tim Wotherspoon (Vice Chairman)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Dave Baigent	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Tim Bick	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Noel Kavanagh	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor John Williams	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Kevin Cuffley	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Sir Michael Marshall	Marshall Group
Claire Ruskin	Cambridge Network
Andy Williams	AstraZeneca
Helen Valentine	Anglia Ruskin University
Dr John Wells	Cancer Research UK Cambridge Institute

Members or substitutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board in attendance:

Councillor Ian Bates, Transport Portfolio Holder Cambridgeshire County Council

Officers/advisors:

Rachel Stopard	Interim Chief Executive, Greater Cambridge Partnership
Niamh Matthews	Strategic Programme and Commissioning Manager, Greater Cambridge Partnership
Chris Tunstall	Interim Director of Transport, Greater Cambridge Partnership
Chris Malyon	Finance Director, Cambridgeshire County Council
Victoria Wallace	Democratic Services Officer, South Cambridgeshire District Council

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Bridget Smith, Councillor Grenville Chamberlain and Mark Robertson.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In relation to agenda item 6, Councillor Kevin Cuffley informed the Joint Assembly that he had been involved in all the Local Liaison Forum meetings and conversations.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 13th September 2017, were agreed as a correct record, subject to the following amendments:

- Councillor Smith had requested bullet point 4 at page 10 of the minutes be amended to:
‘Councillor Bridget Smith referred to the recommendation of some members of the LLF, that consideration be given to a rail focused park and ride at Foxton and recalled that support for some improvements had been agreed in principle some time ago’.
- Under point 9 on page 14 of the minutes, the word ‘with’ would be added to the wording of the recommendation.

4. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Three questions had been received from members of the public, one of which was not accepted for the meeting but would receive a written response and be kept informed by officers of when relevant reports would be presented to the Executive Board. The other two questions had been accepted and would be addressed at agenda item 10.

8. PETITIONS

No petitions were received.

6. A1307 THREE CAMPUSES TO CAMBRIDGE (A1307 HAVERHILL TO CAMBRIDGE) - 25 MINS (2.15PM - 2.40PM)

Councillor Tony Orgee, Chairman of the Local Liaison Forum (LLF), updated the Joint Assembly on the work of the LLF:

- Five workshops had taken place to develop options for the A1307 Haverhill to Cambridge corridor. 200 ideas had come forward which were grouped into 40 proposals. Three workshops took place to look at these proposals, focussing on a particular part of the route at each workshop.
- The three strategies set out in the officer report to the Joint Assembly, had been developed by the LLF and presented at its workshop in September 2017. Councillor Orgee explained that all three strategies were identical between Fourwentways and Haverhill. The LLF considered it appropriate that all three strategies be taken forward to consultation by the GCP Executive Board.
- Councillor Orgee urged that the work on the A1307 Haverhill to Cambridge corridor not be seen in isolation from the other work of the GCP and that the work of the GCP not be seen in isolation from the work of other organisations, such as the Combined Authority.

The GCP Interim Director of Transport presented the report and the recommendations that would be made to the Executive Board, explaining that some park and ride sites were no longer suitable and more sites needed to be identified. Public consultation was therefore anticipated to start in February 2018.

Councillor Ian Bates was in attendance as the Transport Portfolio Holder for the GCP Executive Board. He thanked the LLF Chairman on behalf of the Executive Board for the LLF’s work on the development of the three strategies, which reflected the direction of travel members of the public wanted to see.

The Joint Assembly was invited to comment on the report and proposals:

- Members commended the LLF for its work on developing the three strategies and supported the recommendation to the Executive Board that these be put forward for consultation.
- Councillor Williams requested that if no major concerns regarding the section between the A11 and Haverhill were raised during the consultation, this be progressed regardless of the outcomes of the consultation in relation to the strategies for the section between the A11 and Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC). Officers confirmed that subject to the consultation's outcome they would be recommending moving forward with this.
- Claire Ruskin supported the next steps and milestones, but commented that the project name 'Three Campuses to Cambridge' was meaningless and should not be used. She supported the use of the name 'Haverhill to Cambridge'. She further commented that the speed with which this work progressed needed to be proportionate to the immense speed of growth of employment on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. Officers commented that they were hoping to progress rapidly.
- Councillor Bick welcomed the LLF's development of Option 1. He was keen to see existing populations benefit from improvements to transport infrastructure where possible and Option 1 appeared to provide this to the existing population of Sawston. The other options did not seem to provide the same level of benefit to existing populations.
- Councillor Cuffley queried the reasons for consultation being delayed until February 2018. Officers advised this was due to some park and ride sites now being unsuitable and new sites needing to be looked at. New sites would be put forward to the Executive Board in February 2018 when it was anticipated discussions with landowners would have taken place. Officers advised that all three strategies being put forward required park and ride provision.
- Cllr Kavanagh referred to the statistic relating to pedestrians and cyclists, which suggested a projected drop in cycling. The Interim Transport Director explained the figure did not reflect a reduction as it was based on a proportion of an expected 25% increase in traffic. He further explained that modelling did not deal well with cycling and was more suited to motorised vehicular traffic.
- Andy Williams reiterated that growth at CBC was rapid, with 17,250 jobs located there. This was 50% more than had been estimated and it was predicted that this would grow more rapidly. Officers reassured members that 28,000 jobs had been predicted at CBC and this was being factored into modelling along with all anticipated development along that corridor.
- Sir Michael Marshall indicated preference for option 1, with concern regarding the other options being the impact of single lane roads, particularly on emergency vehicles moving through traffic.

The Chairman summed up the discussions which had reflected general support for the way forward being recommended to the Executive Board, with all three strategies being put forward for consultation. The Joint Assembly recommended that the strategies should be consulted on early in the new year without the need to identify the park and ride sites but also acknowledged that park and ride sites should be consulted on in future once the preferred strategy had been identified. The Joint Assembly also requested that officers pursue the options common to all three strategies once the Board had received and agreed the result of the consultation.

The change of the project's name was discussed, with the Joint Assembly's views on the change to the project's name invited. Cllr Cuffley supported the use of the name 'Three Campuses to Cambridge'. Other names suggested were 'The Haverhill Trail' and 'Granta

Park to Cambridge'. The Vice-Chairman recommended the LLF be asked to consider a new name for the project. The Chairman of the LLF agreed with this, as did the other Joint Assembly members.

7. WESTERN ORBITAL - 20 MINS (2.40PM-3.00PM)

Helen Bradbury, Chairman of the Western Orbital Local Liaison Forum, was invited to address the Joint Assembly. She brought the following points to their attention:

1. **Process** – the LLF requested that more time be given between the publication of end stage reports and the timing of the subsequent Joint Assembly meeting so that it could better feed its recommendations, concerns and suggestions into the decision-making process. The timing structure made it difficult for the Joint Assembly to take account of the LLF's views and consequently the LLF did not believe that its views, recommendations and suggestions were given adequate consideration. The LLF Chairman explained the considerable amount of work that needed to be done by the LLF in the time between reports being published and Joint Assembly meetings taking place. This had been particularly difficult for the LLF in September 2017 with a large number of documents to consider in 12 days between publication of the Joint Assembly papers and the subsequent meeting. The LLF therefore recommended that an extra week be given between the publication of relevant end stage reports and the timing of the subsequent Joint Assembly meeting, to enable the LLF to carry out its relevant business within a reasonable timescale before the meeting.
2. **Connectivity at junction 13**- The LLF did not believe that it was sensible to decide the alignment of the Cambourne to Cambridge busway first. The LLF believed that connectivity of a Western Orbital service to Cambourne to Cambridge bus services was of key importance. End to end journey times and journey quality from west of Cambridge settlements to key employment sites such as the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, were a critical factor in judging the benefit of these schemes, to allow proper evaluation of benefit to cost ratio. The LLF requested that the Joint Assembly recommended to the Executive Board that end-to-end journey metrics be included in all documentation on this and related schemes moving forward, particularly in the forthcoming consultation literature.
3. **Park and Ride at junction 11** – the LLF needed more information and more options to be put forward in order to provide a considered response to this. The LLF wanted to know why other locations around M11 junction 11 had been rejected so early in the process. The LLF acknowledged the importance of adequate park and ride provision near M11 junction 11, but had serious reservations about both park and ride options presented in the end stage report. The LLF felt it had not received answers to the questions it had asked of the Joint Assembly in September 2017. Trumpington Residents Association had raised many questions about the visual impact on the local community particularly if the Trumpington park and ride was decked, the impact on the local network if it was extended, what would happen during construction and the value for money per new parking space. The Joint Assembly was informed that Hauxton and Haston parish councils had questions regarding the impact on their villages of a large park and ride west of the M11, such as traffic through the villages which were already congested, access to the new site and concerns about erosion of the green belt buffer between Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire villages. The LLF had passed a resolution at its 17 June 2017 meeting that the new park and ride should be sited before congestion began and as a general principal that new transport infrastructure should not be allowed to urbanise villages surrounding the city or unduly damage the city's greenbelt.

The LLF Chairman asked for the following in order to allow community feedback to be given:

1. A written response to the questions that the LLF had asked of the GCP at its September 2017 meeting.
2. A written response to the LLF's new concerns, voiced at its meeting on 31st October 2017, about each of the proposed sites.
3. Further possible sites to be brought forward, together with an explanation as to why other sites around junction 11 had been rejected.
4. As the evidence base on the number of parking spaces projected to be needed around the M11 in 2031 did not factor in the impact of the new Cambridge South rail station, or the potential effect of increased parking provision further south along the A10 (for example at Foxton station), the LLF requested officers provided data and modelling on these two points.
5. Where commuters were travelling to and not just where they were coming from, needed to be considered to enable informed community feedback to be given on the required size and location of park & ride provision at junction 11.

The Joint Assembly Chairman asked officers to provide written answers to the questions the LLF felt had not been answered. Councillor Ian Bates agreed to organise a meeting between himself and Ms Bradbury to discuss in details the LLF's concerns in detail.

The Interim Director of Transport responded to the points raised by the LLF Chairman while presenting the report:

- It was clarified that the western orbital was originally going to be a new road but was then looked at to run on the M11 between junctions 11, 12 and 13.
- The M11 was being dealt with as apart of the smart motorway upgrade with Highways England.
- The recommendation regarding junction 11 was to look at a new park and ride site to accommodate the parking capacity that was needed for the anticipated increase in traffic volume. This was rather than doing more with the existing park and ride site at Trumpington. An alternative site was being looked into and there were limitations on where this could be. A consultation group would be set up to work on this. Foxton was being looked at as part of the process.
- Park and cycle at junction 12 at Barton was looked at however, colleagues from the Cambridge cycling group advised there would be little use of this therefore the Executive Board would be advised not to consider this.
- M11 junction 13 was tied up with Cambourne to Cambridge and the recommendation was for this to be dealt with as part of the Cambourne to Cambridge proposals.
- As the Western Orbital LLF had two major schemes on it, it was considered beneficial to remove junction 11 from the work of this LLF and to create a consultation group to look at this.
- Cambridge South station would be considered, although it was pointed out that the only developments that could ultimately be factored in were those that were in the approved Local Plan.

The Joint Assembly considered the overall approach being recommended to the Executive Board to develop a full business case for a preferred option for a new park and ride site immediately to the north west of junction 11 of the M11, to include increased park and ride capacity and access/bus priority measures both into and out of the park and ride along Trumpington Road for city bound park and ride bus services. The business case would compare the costs and benefits of a new park and ride site against significant expansion of the existing site at Trumpington.

The Joint Assembly debated the proposals:

- Andy Williams informed members that AstraZeneca strongly supported new park and ride capacity at M11 junction 11 and at Fourwentways. This was based on evidence gathered by AstraZeneca which mapped where employees were coming from based on where they lived and where they were going to. AstraZeneca also had predictive software which could map what would happen if there was a train station. Mr Williams offered to work with officers to make information available where possible in order to help with mapping. Mr Williams understood the concerns of the local population but emphasized that more park and ride capacity was critical and needed to be in place by 2019. He questioned the lengthy timeline of the end of 2021 for a new park and ride to be built.
- Cllr Bick advised that the GCP should be planning on the basis of scenario three of the modelling of the number of parking spaces needed by 2031. Additional demand management measures in the city needed to be envisaged. These additional measures were critical and a sense of urgency needed to be renewed regarding this. There were significant constraints of the existing park and ride site at Trumpington due to the new community built around it, therefore the Harston side of the M11 needed to be considered for a new park and ride site rather than extending the Trumpington site.
- Some members felt that large expansion of the existing park and ride site would be disruptive and add to the already substantial congestion around the entry and exit to the park and ride. The use of the existing footprint at Trumpington did however need to be optimised.
- Cllr Bick referred to access to a potential new park and ride site at Harston via a new bridge, advising that there may be issues with this as this would be part of a country park that was envisaged. In response to this, the Transport Director informed members that access to a new park and ride site had been discussed with Highways England. The existing service bridge would take the weight to enable access to the site. Other possibilities for access to the site were being looked at.
- Cllr Bick asked whether the park and ride could be moved off the site at Trumpington, or whether commitments had been made to John Lewis, which tied the park and ride to this site.
- Cllr Bick asked for further opportunity for the Joint Assembly to discuss the smart motorway issue that was being discussed with Highways England, to ensure it would deliver what was needed.
- Councillor Kavanagh agreed that the existing park and ride site at Trumpington should not be expanded and that a new park and ride site with plenty of capacity should be built. He asked if a new park and ride site were built, whether the existing park and ride site could be taken out of service and turned over to use for housing.
- Claire Ruskin highlighted the need to manage growth well and that with more access to the hospital and jobs needed, more parking spaces would be needed. Ms Ruskin supported the idea of expanding the existing park and ride site at Trumpington as this would be the quickest and easiest thing to do, but advised that new park and ride sites were also needed. Hubs also needed to be considered.
- Dr Wells commented that given the rate of growth of jobs on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, there was urgency for a solution which needed to be consulted on.
- Some members expressed disappointment that park and cycle was not being taken forward. Councillors Baigent, Kavanagh and Dr Wells spoke in favour of park and cycle and suggested trial of small scale park and cycle which could be expanded if demand materialized suggested. It was proposed that this be considered on an existing park and ride site.

The Interim Director of Transport responded to the points raised:

- The Joint Assembly's comments about a trial park and cycle would be taken onboard.
- The Joint Assembly was informed that it would take 18 months to build a new park and ride site, however the planning process and consultation took more time hence the timeline of 2021 for build of a new site.
- The GCP was talking to Highways England about the junctions to make them more accessible to park and ride buses.
- Travel hubs were being looked at. These were envisaged to be places with coffee shops, electric charging points, cycle provision and the potential for the provision of office space.

Councillor Ian Bates added:

- Trumpington park and ride was owned by Cambridgeshire County Council and a bus from here went to the biomedical campus.
- The County Council did have an agreement with John Lewis regarding the long term provision of their retail collection point at the park and ride site.

Councillor Bick queried how the Joint Assembly's views would be represented to the Executive Board by not voting on recommendations. The GCP Interim Chief Executive assured members that their views would be captured and fed back to the Executive Board with the relevant Portfolio Holder present at the meeting to hear their views. Views expressed would be fed into the officer report to the Executive Board following the Joint Assembly meeting. The Joint Assembly Chairman would also be submitting a report on the Joint Assembly meeting to the Executive Board, which would reflect the views expressed by members.

Councillor Tim Bick proposed that a steer was given to the Executive Board that further park and ride development should only be on the Harston side of the M11. This was seconded by Councillor Williams and a vote was taken with five members voting in favour of the proposal, five against and two abstaining.

8. RAPID MASS TRANSIT STRATEGIC OPTIONS APPRAISAL - 30 MINS (3.00PM-3.30PM)

The Joint Assembly heard a presentation from Steer Davies Gleave, the consultants leading the rapid mass transit strategic options appraisal. Following the presentation, Joint Assembly members asked a number of questions and in response to these, were informed of the following:

- A long list of options regarding the type of transport for mass transit, was being considered. In response to a question regarding whether cable cars had been considered for use in certain areas for short distances, the Joint Assembly was informed that cable cars were not a mass transit option. Tram trains were not on the shortlist of options, with the Department of Transport having advised that this should not be pursued.
- Possible levels of growth post 2031 were being considered, with scenarios such as satellite developments on city fringes where major biomedical companies located back office functions and start-ups, may choose to locate.
- Fundability and affordability of transport options was being considered, with options needing to be financially sustainable and demonstrate value for money for users.
- Claire Ruskin invited the consultants to provide an update at an event looking at the future of transport, taking place on 30 November 2017.

9. HISTON ROAD - 15 MINS (3.30PM-3.45PM)

The Interim Director of Transport gave an overview of the officer responses to the resolutions of the Histon Road Local Liaison Forum, advising that officers agreed with most of the LLF's resolutions. The Interim Director of Transport advised that on street parking at the southern end of Histon Rd/Huntingdon Road needed to be looked at as it was causing issues due to the narrowness of the road. Bus priority at the far end at Kings Hedges to Gilbert Road needed to be looked. The Joint Assembly was informed that under the 'do maximum' approach, a bus lane from Kings Hedges to Gilbert Road had been suggested, which would have involved taking gardens away due to the narrowness of the road. Following further work between officers and the LLF, the Board would be advised that this bus lane option was not necessary, with a bus gate and bus priority to be considered instead. Officers would work closely with the Histon Road LLF to minimise any impact on trees. The Transport Director explained the scheme was being proposed up to the A14 junction. Subject to Board agreement, a revised concept scheme would come back to the Greater Cambridge Partnership by March 2018.

The Joint Assembly considered the report and commented on the progress and officer recommendations to the Executive Board. The following points were raised:

- Some Joint Assembly members questioned whether it was plausible to do something that would actually improve access along Histon Road. It was felt that a point of diminishing returns was being reached. There was support for the direction of travel outlined in the report, though it was felt that the result would not be transformative. In response to this, officers advised that consultants were looking into whether there was a good benefit to cost ratio. Whilst the Joint Assembly's views were acknowledged and appreciated, the Interim Director of Transport felt strongly that Histon Road needed to be looked at.
- Sir Michael Marshall advised that much pressure on Histon Road could be reduced by having a proper feed off from the M11 at junction 13 southbound. The Interim Director of Transport advised that junction 13 would be tied in with discussions with Highways England regarding smart motorways.
- Councillor Kavanagh felt that the reference needed to be made to the safety of cyclists rather than the 'comfort' of cycling as referred to in the report. He stressed that the Huntingdon Road end of Histon Road was one of the most dangerous stretches for cyclists. Officers accepted this point, acknowledging that it was a well known incident spot for cyclists.
- Councillor Bick expressed his support for the direction of travel outlined in the report and congratulated the LLF on their work with officers.
- The Director of Transport emphasised that problems on roads were caused by junctions rather than links between junctions, with queuing occurring on the links due to congestion at the junctions.
- The Joint Assembly was informed that Histon Road and the A10 Trumpington Road had seen the most significant increase in traffic. Traffic on all other corridors had plateaued as the queues were already there.
- The LLF was congratulated for its work with officers. Councillor Bates advised that the Joint Assembly's conversation needed to be fed back to the Histon Road LLF. The Vice Chairman of the LLF was present at the meeting.

The Joint Assembly broadly supported the direction of travel outlined in the report to move away from the 'do maximum' approach which had previously been proposed, and noted that subject to the outcome of the Executive Board meeting, a revised concept scheme for Histon Road would be presented to the Executive Board in March 2018.

10. QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT - 10 MINS (3.45PM-3.55PM)

The Chairman invited Mike Mason and Councillor Susan van de Ven to ask their questions relating to this item, which had been submitted in line with the provisions of Standing Orders. Details of the questions and a summary of the answers given are set out in Appendix A to the minutes. In response to comments made by Councillor van de Ven, the Chairman assured her that officers would update the report before it was presented to the Executive Board, to reflect that the Cambridge to Royston cycle scheme was not complete and was missing a critical link.

The Strategic Programme and Commissioning Manager presented the quarterly progress report, which updated Joint Assembly members on progress across the Greater Cambridge Partnership programme. The GCP Interim Chief Executive drew Joint Assembly members' attention to the recommendations to the Executive Board regarding Cambridge South station, the Park and Ride subsidy, the Girton Interchange and Cambridgeshire rail study, as outlined in the appendices to the report.

The Joint Assembly noted the recommendations to the Executive Board and discussed the proposals, raising the following points:

- While members supported the proposals which would enable the removal of the £1 parking charge at park and ride sites from 1st April 2018, they questioned what the long term sustainable source of funding was for this and whether parking charges would be reinstated once the GCP funding ended. Furthermore, members were of the opinion that the park and ride charge should never have been imposed and that the Cambridge City Deal funding had not been awarded to fund existing services in order to keep them going. Members felt this was questionable in relation to the purposes for which the original City Deal had been set up; to fund sustainable growth and infrastructure.
- Members asked whether there was a commitment from Cambridgeshire County Council that parking charges at park and ride sites, including at new sites to be developed by the GCP, would not be reinstated in future. It was felt that if the County Council reinstated park and ride parking charges in future, it would go against the GCP's work in trying to achieve a modal shift to public transport as the preferred form of transport. In response to this, the County Council's Finance Director informed members that for the next five years, income from the park and ride charge had been removed from County Council financial plans and Council resources were being managed without that income. A perpetual commitment could not however be made by officers and an ongoing revenue stream would have to be found.
- Councillor Williams asked whether Cambridge South station would be accessible to residents as well as those who worked at the Cambridge Biomedical Campus.
- Councillor Williams requested that the Executive Board be asked to look at a cost to benefit review of extended opening times of park and ride sites and extended operating times of buses. He advised that services would be better used if they were available from earlier and until later.
- Councillor Williams advised that the mass transit study should be linked with the rail study.
- In response to a question from Councillor Baigent regarding progress on negotiations regarding the Chisholm Trail in the Romsey area, members were informed that the GCP was in lengthy talks with Network Rail regarding this. Land agreements had almost been reached regarding the bridge over the River Cam, with heads of terms drafted. Ground investigation work had been conducted nearby. Agreements were in place for phase 1 of the Chisholm Trail. The focus had been on getting phase 1 of the project moving as some of the land to build the new bridge was time limited.

The Joint Assembly broadly supported the proposals that would be made to the GCP Executive Board, with their views to be incorporated in the reporting to the Executive Board.

11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING - 5 MINS (3.55PM-4.00PM)

The Joint Assembly noted that the date of the next meeting was Thursday 18th January 2018 at 2pm in the Kreis Viersen Room, Shire Hall, Cambridge.

12. APPENDIX A TO THE MINUTES (QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO PUBLIC QUESTIONS)

The Meeting ended at 4.40 p.m.

Minute Item 12

Appendix A to the minutes of the Greater Cambridge Partnership meeting 02 November 2017 – public questions and answers

No	Questioner	Question	Response
10a	Mike Mason	<p>I refer the joint assembly to Agenda Item 10 Appendices 1 and 3. The financial reporting arrangements for GCP are unsound in that there is no public confidence in the budgeting process, financial control or value for money spent. Table 2 leads one to suspect that the figures under columns “Actual to Date”, “Forecast Outturn” and “Forecast Variance” are optimistic guesswork.</p> <p>I ask, are the “Actual to Date” figures verifiable by means of invoices from suppliers or cross authority documented charges (e.g. LA Admin. Costs, line 8)?</p> <p>Are these costs clearly and unambiguously defined in the County Council public payments data?</p> <p>If so will GCP publish a definitive list of cost centres for all of its expenditure headings to ensure that there is a clear audit trail and public accountability?</p> <p>If it is accepted that the County is the “Accounting Body” then what are the arrangements for recording all income including S106 money, housing and other grants or contributions, within the County Council’s comprehensive income and expenditure statement (CIES) which forms part of its audited accounts?</p> <p>With regard to Appendix 3, I would question whether the recommendation to use GCP funds to support revenue budget income shortfall in one of its constituent authorities is either legal, or within the spirit of the grant award by HM Government?</p> <p>Furthermore are Assembly Members aware that the County Council is recording the City Deal/GCP Government Grant funding of £60M, to be received in future years 3,4,and 5, as “Useable Assets” in the third version of the 2016/17 Statement of Accounts?</p>	<p>I ask, are the “Actual to Date” figures verifiable by means of invoices from suppliers or cross authority documented charges (e.g. LA Admin. Costs, line 8)? Yes</p> <p>Are these costs clearly and unambiguously defined in the County Council public payments data? Yes – If above £500 they are detailed in the published payment data (which excluded salary costs and any data which is confidential).</p> <p>If so will GCP publish a definitive list of cost centres for all of its expenditure headings to ensure that there is a clear audit trail and public accountability? Yes (see appendix one in the third page of this document)</p> <p>If it is accepted that the County is the “Accounting Body” then what are the arrangements for recording all income including S106 money, housing and other grants or contributions, within the County Council’s comprehensive income and expenditure statement (CIES) which forms part of its audited accounts? The County Council is the accountable body of the £100m City Deal grant.</p> <p>Regarding S106 income and capital grants/contributions with conditions attached, this is recorded within the Capital grants and contributions section of the Taxation and Non-Specific Grant Income section of the CIES at the point when income is applied to expenditure (as per the CIPFA Code of Practice). For capital grants/ contributions which have no conditions unmet, these are recognised in the CIES within the Capital grants and contributions section at the point at which the income is received. Revenue grants are credited to Taxation and Non-Specific Grant income or the relevant service directorate depending on the grant in question- please see page 70 of the published Statement of Accounts for example: https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/council/finance-and-budget/statement-of-accounts/</p> <p>With regard to Appendix 3, I would question whether the recommendation to use GCP funds to support revenue budget income shortfall in one of its constituent authorities is either legal, or within the spirit of the grant award by HM Government? The proposal to remove the charge at the County Council owned park and ride sites is not a proposal to cover the shortfall in income of the County Council. The County Council has no operational need to remove the charge and therefore the GCP is working with the County Council in order to support the strategic outcomes of the GCP by increasing patronage of public transport from these sites. GCP is funded by City Deal Grant (which can be used for capital or revenue activities), New Homes Bonus (revenue), S106 (capital), and interest on balances (revenue).</p> <p>Furthermore are Assembly Members aware that the County Council is recording the City Deal/GCP Government Grant funding of £60M, to be received in future years 3,4,and 5, as “Useable Assets” in the third version of the 2016/17 Statement of Accounts? A £60m debtor has been recognised in the County Council’s Statement of Accounts for the £20m grant funding yet to be received in years 3, 4 and 5. The unused grant has been moved to the Capital Grants Unapplied Account as expenditure has not yet been incurred. The Capital Grants Unapplied Account forms part of the County Council’s Useable Reserves as per the CIPFA Code of Practice and was an approach agreed by the Council’s independent external auditors. The County Council will be spending the City Deal grant in future years as per the budgets agreed by the GCP.</p> <p>Page 36 of the published Statement of Accounts 2016-17 has more details on the 2016-17 accounting treatment: https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/council/finance-and-budget/statement-of-accounts/</p>

10b	Cllr Susan van de Ven	<p>With a relatively modest investment, the Cambridge-Royston cycle scheme could be quickly completed, within the Greater Cambridge Partnership Tranche 1 timeframe.</p> <p>I am not here to set out the detailed case for the scheme – that has already been done many times over, and the fact that it is near completion, thanks to GCP support, speaks for itself.</p> <p>The question now is how to tackle the remaining Melbourn - Royston two-mile stretch, given that this geography straddles a county border. The route consists of a pedestrian/cycle path in Cambridgeshire and a pedestrian/cycle bridge beginning in Cambridgeshire and landing in Hertfordshire.</p> <p>This is a shovel ready project that would deliver significant economic benefits, and make a substantial contribution to reducing reliance on the private car for travel to key areas of employment in Cambridge and along the A10 corridor. It will maximise the benefits of the investments in this route already made by GCP and others – indeed the whole will be greater than the sum of its parts. Because it has the potential to be delivered within the existing GCP funding period, it can demonstrate real progress on innovative, economically led schemes to Government.</p> <p>Ideally the Melbourn-Royston link should be delivered in one go. However, the overall Cambridge-Royston scheme has been delivered in segments as funding has become available, and this pragmatic approach has produced results. Nevertheless, any cross-border scheme demands a collaborative approach, as the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough LEP indicated last December when it pledged financial support for the project. Royston sits within the LEP’s remit, unsurprisingly given Royston’s Cambridge-facing business orientation.</p> <p>That collaborative approach is now taking shape: four global companies that jointly employ thousands of workers in Royston and Melbourn have pledged financial support or made indicative pledges, totalling £120K. Hertfordshire County Council funded and completed the bridge feasibility study and have formally committed lifetime maintenance costs for the bridge, estimated at £580K. Last month, Royston Town Council voted unanimously to commit £30K toward bridge costs, matching the commitment made by AstraZeneca. AstraZeneca has also provided a £10K grant for vegetation maintenance along the whole of the Cambridge-Royston cycle route. The A10 Corridor Cycling Campaign, with many of its members cycling to work, has raised £1.5K in small donations toward bridge costs.</p> <p>As the owner of Melbourn Science Park said to the City Deal Board last year, the A10 Cambridge- Royston cycle scheme will not only alleviate pressures on Science Park parking, which is at capacity, but it will allow the Science Park to create more jobs. This is precisely down to a significantly greater take-up of cycling, not driving, to work.</p> <p>Job creation and sustainable transport links are the key drivers for GPC investment, and partnership is the defining approach. Therefore, I would like to ask for the Assembly’s support in proposing that the GPC commit necessary funds to complete the Cambridgeshire portion of this scheme, which amounts to approximately £2 million, and works with the LEP to ensure release of their pledged funds to deliver the whole scheme within the timescales I have noted here.</p> <p>This would be great win: win for residents, businesses, the GCP and the LEP.</p>	<p>We are really pleased to have been able to deliver this scheme as the first GCP scheme, and are really encouraged to hear all the positive feedback the scheme has generated.</p> <p>Given the opportunity the extension presents, I think it’s something members should be thinking about adding to the Future Investment Strategy for consideration under the transport workstream.</p>
-----	-----------------------	--	--

Appendix One – Greater Cambridge Partnership Cost Centres

Cost centre	Cost centre description
UC20000	City Deal - NHB Funding
UC20010	CD - Programme Central Co-ordination
UC20020	CD - Strategic Communications
UC20030	CD – Skills
UC20040	CD - Economic Assessment
UC20050	CD - Smart Cambridge
UC20070	CD – Housing
UC20092	CD - Affordable Housing
UC20093	CD - Intelligent Mobility
UC20094	Cambridgeshire County Council costs
UC20096	South Cambridgeshire District Council costs
UC21000	City Access - Core Programme
UC21010	City Access - Bus Improvements
UC21020	City Access - Cycling Provision
UC21030	City Access - Demand Management
UC21040	City Access - Engagement & Comms
UC21050	City Access - Parking Management
UC21060	City Access - Public Space and Air Quality
UC21070	City Access - Travel Planning
UC22000	Developing 12 cycling greenways
UC23000	Electric Vehicle Charging
UC23010	Travel Audit - South Station and biomedical campus
UC23020	Travel Hubs
UC23050	Cambridge Promotions
UC23060	Towards 2050
UC23070	City Centre spaces & movement
UC24000	Residents Parking implementation

Project Group - Capital	
3520	Histon Rd
3521	Milton Rd
3522	Chisholm Trail
3523	A428 to M11
3524	Programme management and early scheme development
3525	City Centre capacity improvements
3526	A1307
3527	Cross City Cycle improvements
3528	Western Orbital
3529	A10 North Study
3530	A10 Frog End

This page is left blank intentionally.