



**GREATER
CAMBRIDGE
CITY DEAL**

Securing future prosperity

GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL EXECUTIVE BOARD

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board held on
Thursday, 1 September 2016 at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board:

Councillor Lewis Herbert	Cambridge City Council (Chairman)
Councillor Francis Burkitt	South Cambridgeshire District Council (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Ian Bates	Cambridgeshire County Council
Mark Reeve	Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership
Professor Nigel Slater	University of Cambridge

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

Andy Williams	AstraZeneca
Councillor Roger Hickford	Cambridgeshire County Council and Chairman of the Joint Assembly
Councillor Noel Kavanagh	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Bridget Smith	South Cambridgeshire District Council

Officers/advisors:

Stephen Kelly	Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council
Sarah Haywood	Cambridgeshire County Council
Graham Hughes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Aaron Blowers	City Deal Partnership
Beth Durham	City Deal Partnership
Joanna Harrall	City Deal Partnership
Tanya Sheridan	City Deal Partnership
Caroline Hunt	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Graham Watts	South Cambridgeshire District Council

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 13 July 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

4. QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Questions by members of the public were asked and answered as follows:

Question by Charles Nisbet

Charles Nisbet asked for assurance that the Greater Cambridge City Deal had the legal authority to spend any part of its funding on providing trees to replace those that it intended to remove from Milton Road or Histon Road.

Graham Hughes, Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, confirmed that the City Deal Executive Board did have the legal authority to spend part of its funding on replacing trees as part of a transport infrastructure scheme. The County Council, as highways authority, had delegated its powers to the City Deal Executive Board in respect of City Deal transport infrastructure schemes and Mr Hughes confirmed that landscaping would form an integral part of these schemes and that the Board would be approving such details.

Question by Dr James Smith

Dr Smith asked what health impact assessment of the City Deal transport projects and proposals had been undertaken to date and what, if any, further health impact assessment was expected.

Mr Hughes confirmed that health impacts had been considered at a strategic level as part of the Strategic Environmental Assessment of the third Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan, from which the City Deal schemes were drawn. Further detailed assessments of individual schemes would be undertaken as part of the statutory processes that governed the delivery of major transport infrastructure schemes.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, reflected on air pollution in the city and highlighted that partners would continue to investigate solutions and any funding that may be available to help address the issue. He added that this would include working with bus and taxi operators.

Councillor Ian Bates reminded the Board that public health was a County Council responsibility and an integral part of the work that Cambridgeshire County Council was doing across the county.

Question by Antony Carpen

Antony Carpen asked why the Executive Board's risk management framework had not been signed off under the Shadow Assembly and Board, or at the first meetings of both bodies.

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, gave an assurance that risk had been managed since the inception of the City Deal Programme. She said that the fact that there had not been a single consolidated Risk Management Framework specifically for the City Deal up to now should not be taken as a reflection that the discipline of risk management had not been taking place. This had been guided by the principle enshrined in the Executive Board's Terms of Reference that the processes of the lead Council for a certain function should be followed for that specific function.

Now that the Programme was moving into a delivery phase it was right that clearer political oversight was brought into the process and the proposed Risk Management Framework scheduled for consideration at this meeting at a later item sought to facilitate this.

Antony Carpen also asked what assessment Cambridge University and its colleges had made of the submissions to the City Deal provided by Rail Haverhill, Wisbech Rail and the Connected Cambridge Light Rail.

Professor Nigel Slater, Pro-Vice-Chancellor at the University of Cambridge, felt unable to comment since the question related to his employer rather than the business of the City Deal Executive Board. He added, however, that the University in its response to the devolution consultation did agree with the broad priorities and principle of encouraging improved transport links across the area, and beyond.

Professor Slater made the point that colleges were separate institutions, of which there were 31 in Cambridge, and that he had no authority to comment on their activities.

Question by Angela Chadwyck-Healey

Representing the Madingley Road Area Residents' Association, Angela Chadwyck-Healey thought that proposed City Deal measures would cause chaos within the city, surrounding streets and the M11 when drivers would seek alternative routes following the introduction of Peak Congestion Control Points. She asked why no Peak Congestion Control Points were being proposed for roads in the north and north-west of Cambridge.

Mr Hughes explained that current engagement on the eight point plan was on the principles involved, such as the introduction of Peak Congestion Control Points, and was an early stage of the process. At this stage, assessment of Control Points and modelling to date had indicated that a scheme involving six main Peak Congestion Control Points, as outlined in the engagement material, was likely to lead to improvements to traffic conditions across the city, including the roads to the north as many through movements in the area were removed. The impact would therefore be citywide. Mr Hughes accepted that traffic would be displaced, but made the point that significant changes in people's choice of mode of travel were also expected. This would be in parallel with the introduction of Control Points and much improved alternatives such as Park and Ride, bus services and improved conditions for pedestrians and cyclists.

Councillor Herbert supported these comments and reported that the Board had looked at different combinations of measures and the evidence surrounding different traffic impacts. He felt that the proposed Peak Congestion Control Points would achieve a significant impact on peak time car movement and help achieve reliable peak time bus services.

Question by Mal Schofield

Mal Schofield was concerned with the lack of detail set out in the City Deal progress report under item 8 at this meeting in relation to each of the schemes coming forward for consideration by Joint Assembly and Executive Board at future meetings. Regarding the city centre capacity improvements scheme, for example, the commentary included the words '25 January 2017: Executive Board to consider responses and feedback, and decide whether to approve project delivery', which he felt was too simplistic and did not give sufficient justification to the size of the scheme.

Mr Hughes agreed that there were lots of significant issues out for consultation, scheduled to be reported back into the Joint Assembly and the Executive Board. He explained that there was a series of other schemes and that they would all come together as part of the City Deal package. Officers had been looking at how schemes fed into each other and came together. To assist with the Board's decision-making in this respect, an important aspect of future reporting would be to highlight how respective schemes related to one another.

Tanya Sheridan accepted that the scheme referred to in the question consisted of a number of elements and that this could be better reflected in the Forward Plan.

Councillor Herbert took the point that the wording was not detailed enough in the progress report, adding that demand management was an essential feature of the City Deal programme. He said that by making early progress in this respect other transport infrastructure schemes would be able to benefit from and be informed by the introduction of these measures, prior to final decisions being taken on specific schemes.

It was agreed that the following questions by Erik de Visser, Barbara Taylor, Matthew Danish and Michael Page would be taken and answered together due to them consisting of the same or a similar subject:

Question by Erik de Visser

Erik de Visser asked if the plans to widen Histon Road and Milton Road could be delayed until the second tranche of the City Deal, after the trialling of road closures, to see whether widening the road and chopping down trees was absolutely necessary.

Question by Barbara Taylor

Barbara Taylor referred to a Cambridge News article on 30 August 2016 which said that, assuming the proposed peak time road closures went ahead as outlined, that Milton Road and Histon Road would see 'big reductions in traffic'. She assumed that the County Council would agree to a citywide neighbourhood parking scheme that would further reduce cars coming into Cambridge looking for free parking by some considerable percentage and said that if school traffic were to be robustly addressed as well it could add another double-digit reduction. Given all of this, she asked why public money was being spent on expensive, damaging, unproven and resoundingly unpopular bus lanes on Milton Road and Histon Road before the evidence of congestion-busting measures could be assessed.

Question by Matthew Danish

Matthew Danish felt that bus priority did not have to mean destructive road widening and thought that bus journeys could instead be vastly improved through modern measures including contactless fares, multiple doors on buses and correctly and well-placed floating bus stops with step-free boarding. He said that unreliability was not only a peak time problem but a problem all of the time in Cambridge, which he felt bus lanes could not solve and highlighted that evidence suggested modernisation alone would make a huge improvement. In addition to the citywide control point and parking schemes also consulted on, Mr Danish was of the opinion that road widening was even more pointless, citing bus modernisation as an easier and better solution.

Mr Danish referred to the Access Study which suggested that the true cause of bus unreliability was not traffic congestion but was rather unpredictable bus dwell times caused by poor ticketing and boarding practices, with maps in the document showing that

existing bus lanes did not prevent delays to buses.

Mr Danish therefore asked why modernisation could not be used as a basis for bus priority, rather than leaping immediately to tarmac when buses were still operating in an old fashioned way.

Question by Michael Page

Michael Page referred to the Cambridge News article in respect of Peak Congestion Control Points, which highlighted traffic modelling data from Mott McDonald indicating a decrease of 10% or more in traffic flows along Histon Road and Milton Road if the Control Point plan was implemented, together with a decrease of nearly 30% in private car journeys starting and ending in Cambridge as a whole.

He therefore asked why the City Deal would go ahead with expensive and disruptive engineering works on Histon and Milton Roads on the basis of assumptions that would not apply if the city centre congestion plans were implemented.

Addressing the four questions from Erik de Visser, Barbara Taylor, Matthew Danish and Michael Page, Mr Hughes explained that the proposals for Milton Road and Histon Road were part of a package of measures to tackle congestion through improving public transport, cycling and walking. These measures were proposed not just to tackle the current congestion, but to ensure that the city and surrounding area could cope with the very significant planned growth. He emphasised the point that the City Deal Programme was seeking to address congestion problems in the long term, taking into account this growth, rather than focussing on the short term.

Mr Hughes acknowledged that whilst the Peak Congestion Control Points proposals that were being put forward dealt with peak time congestion, there were congestion issues over a much wider period as well. He was of the view, however, that the introduction of Peak Congestion Control Points would assist in addressing congestion at the busiest times of the day and that broader bus priorities on key routes in the city would allow for the improvement of bus reliability at other times.

Reflecting on bus modernisation, Mr Hughes agreed that bus companies probably did need to change the way they provided services in terms of ticketing and boarding, but said that these were not the only issues to consider with the current way in which buses operated. One of the key factors was the fact that buses themselves were getting caught in the same congestion as other traffic, with the disembarking and boarding of buses not having a significant influence on this aspect of their unreliability. The scale of the problem was such that it required some difficult decisions to be made about important roads, with freeing buses from congestion and providing top quality cycling facilities being essential. Mr Hughes added that people would cycle quite long distances if safe provision was put in place, with a lot of that provision coming alongside bus lanes.

In terms of on-street parking, the City Council and County Council were currently working on a revised policy which would seek to discourage people from commuting into the city. School travel also contributed to some of the problems at peak times, particularly in mornings, but Mr Hughes reminded the Board that there was a broader issue to consider in this respect with the problem being less about schools themselves and more about the behaviour of parents.

The assessment of Peak Congestion Control Points had indicated improvements to conditions in the north of the city may be achievable, but there was still a need for improved public transport services and Milton Road and Histon Road would still be busy.

The modernisation principles highlighted by Mr Danish would be of benefit, but would not get the bus through a queue of traffic and running reliably if there was not space for it to bypass the queue.

Mr Hughes confirmed that these measures were targeting a 10% to 15% reduction in congestion and that a balanced package would be necessary to achieve it.

Councillor Herbert reiterated Mr Hughes' response, stating that the approach being adopted consisted of a combination of measures focusing on peak time congestion and necessary local transport infrastructure schemes. He said that local schemes would be able to benefit from the information and data arising from demand management, with up-to-date modelling on its impact able to take place. Councillor Herbert added that, in the Board's view, it was not feasible to delay the introduction of these measures until beyond 2020.

Councillor Francis Burkitt was pleased that people had faith in the Peak Congestion Control Points and Work Place Parking Levy as measures that should be pursued, but agreed that these would not solve the congestion problems in Cambridge on their own and that other measures were also needed.

With regards to bus modernisation, Mr Burkitt agreed with the points made by Mr Danish in this respect, but said that the City Deal could not change the way that buses operated in terms of how services were run. However, the City Deal Programme could create the infrastructure and opportunities to facilitate bus operators investing and modernising in the ways suggested. He was hopeful that by 2017 some of these initiatives would start to be introduced in the Greater Cambridge area, noting that Stagecoach had indicated that it saw Cambridge as a place worth investing in. He also referred to some of the Smart Cambridge measures that would be introduced, such as the launch of an 'app' which would see real time bus journey information for individual buses being made available to the public. Councillor Burkitt highlighted that Stagecoach had also indicated that it would introduce further district fare zones, making it cheaper for people in South Cambridgeshire to travel in and out of Cambridge. He closed by saying that lots of things were happening to encourage people to use buses and was pleased that these were all coming together.

Question by Richard Taylor

Richard Taylor referred to a question asked at a meeting of Cambridgeshire County Council on 19 July 2016 in respect of decisions regarding trees on the public highway. He sought clarity as to whether such decisions regarding City Deal schemes had been delegated to a single officer at the County Council or the City Deal Executive Board.

Mr Hughes explained that for County Council schemes the final decision regarding trees was delegated to him as the Executive Director for Economy, Transport and Environment which he said would always be undertaken in consultation with elected Members. In terms of City Deal schemes, the County Council had delegated its powers regarding trees on the public highway to the City Deal Executive Board, so the Board would take any decisions in this respect and not an officer.

Mr Taylor also asked whether the Board could provide an update on the arrangements for any upcoming workshops and Local Liaison Forum meetings for Milton Road and made the point that they were not running in the same way as other local authority meetings.

Tanya Sheridan reminded Mr Taylor that Local Liaison Forums were communications forums as part of stakeholder engagement and, although open to the public, did not have to comply with the same rules and regulations as other formal local authority meetings.

She confirmed that the dates for upcoming workshops would be communicated once arrangements had been confirmed.

Question by Edward Leigh

Edward Leigh asked for the publication of a number of Web-based Transport Analysis Guide Stage 1 compliance documents and sought confirmation that predicted bus journey time variability would be published as part of the business case reports for all City Deal schemes.

Mr Hughes said that he and his team were completely transparent and confirmed that whatever information they had on the documents requested he would ensure would be made available.

Question by Anne Hamill

Anne Hamill asked whether the Executive Board would make a commitment to having an evenly spaced avenue of mature, flowering trees in grass verges that were a minimum of one metre wide on each side of the whole length of Milton Road.

Councillor Herbert confirmed that the Joint Assembly, following its meeting held on 25 August 2016, had made a recommendation on this issue which was scheduled for consideration as part of the next item at this meeting.

Question by Maureen Mace

Maureen Mace asked how much delay the modelling statistics showed on a normal working day and when the A14 was upgraded or closed due to an incident when the roadworks for widening Milton Road were due to commence. She also asked how many years from the start of the roadworks it would take until the average bus journey time of 99 seconds was reached.

Mr Hughes responded by saying that it would depend entirely on whatever scheme was produced. At this stage there was no detailed scheme to consider, so it was not possible to undertake any modelling as suggested.

Once a specific scheme had been agreed a programme of works would be identified, setting out proposed timescales and any necessary restrictions. He emphasised that works would always seek to minimise delay but that there was a trade-off between speed, which may require full closure of roads, and keeping traffic moving, which would mean schemes took longer to deliver. Mr Hughes noted that the normal process was to undertake work on major routes only outside of peak periods.

5. PETITIONS

Consideration was given to a report which set out the views expressed by County Councillors at the meeting of Cambridgeshire County Council at its meeting on 19 July 2016 in relation to a petition opposing the City Deal plan to widen Milton Road to four lanes of traffic.

It was noted that the Joint Assembly and Executive Board had received a petition from the same petitioner entitled 'save the trees and verges on Milton Road' at their meetings on 2 June 2016 and 9 June 2016, respectively.

In addition to the petition, County Councillor Joceylnne Scutt presented the following resolutions from the Milton Road Local Liaison Forum held on 9 August 2016 in respect of Oaktree Avenue and Hurst Park Avenue:

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

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

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that the Joint Assembly at its meeting on 25 August 2016 had noted the content of the petition, and noted and supported resolutions (i) and (iii) above from the Milton Road Local Liaison Forum. In addition, the Joint Assembly had recommended that the Executive Board made a commitment to having an aspiration for an avenue of mature flowering trees in green verges on each side of Milton Road, consistent with bus reliability and high quality cycling infrastructure provision.

The Executive Board:

- (a) **NOTED** the report and the comments raised by County Councillors during consideration of a petition at the meeting of Cambridgeshire County Council on 19 July 2016.
- (b) **NOTED** the resolutions agreed at the Milton Road Local Liaison Forum meeting held on 9 August 2016.
- (c) **NOTED** the Joint Assembly’s request to confirm its commitment to having an aspiration for an avenue of mature flowering trees in green verges on each side of Milton Road, consistent with bus reliability and high quality cycling infrastructure provision.
- (d) **AGREED**, further to (a), (b) and (c) above, to provide a written response within two weeks confirming the Board’s position with regard to the content of the petition itself, the Milton Road Local Liaison Forum resolutions and the request by the Joint Assembly.

6. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE JOINT ASSEMBLY

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, confirmed that he would provide a report on the Assembly’s recommendations further to its meeting on 25 August 2016 at the relevant item at this meeting.

7. CITY DEAL FORWARD PLAN

The Executive Board considered its Forward Plan.

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, presented the document and highlighted that the 'Western Orbital – consultation results' item, scheduled for consideration by the Board at its meeting on 10 November 2016, would include an update on the M11 Junction 11 work. An item on the Smart Cambridge project would also be considered at that meeting.

Councillor Francis Burkitt referred to the item regarding the selection of preferred options for Cambourne to Cambridge, scheduled for consideration at the meeting of the Board on 13 October 2016. He asked whether at that meeting the Board would be asked to make a decision on a preferred option. Graham Hughes, Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, was not in a position to be able to answer the question but agreed to consult with his team.

Regarding the item on skills, Councillor Burkitt was of the understanding that reports would be presented back to the Board on a quarterly cycle rather than six-monthly as set out in the Forward Plan. Councillor Herbert expressed his concern with reports submitted back to the Board on a quarterly basis, which he felt was too frequent, and agreed to discuss this issue with Councillor Burkitt outside of the meeting.

Councillor Burkitt referred to a letter he had sent to all District Councillors and Parish Council Chairmen and Clerks regarding bus hubs and intended to bring a report, for information, to the meeting of the Executive Board on 10 November 2016. In addition, he had identified other items for scheduling into the Forward Plan for future meetings of the Board, as follows:

- update on the cross-city cycling project;
- update on the Cambridge City greenways project;
- residents' parking in Cambridge and liaison with Councils;
- Park and Ride improvements;
- a City Deal Annual Report for the 2016/17 year.

Tanya Sheridan noted these suggestions and reported that the items on residents' parking and Park and Ride sites would be included as part of the Cambridge access and congestion item scheduled to be considered by the Board at its meeting on 25 January 2017

The Executive Board **NOTED** the Forward Plan.

8. CITY DEAL PROGRESS REPORT

The Executive Board considered a progress report on the City Deal Programme.

Tanya Sheridan presented the report, which set out progress to date of each of the Programme's workstreams.

In addition to the information contained within the report, it was noted that the planning application in relation to the Chisholm Trial was expected to be considered in December 2016.

The Executive Board **NOTED** the progress report.

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

The Executive Board considered a report in relation to monitoring delivery of 1,000 additional new homes on rural exception sites.

Caroline Hunt, Planning Policy Manager, presented the report and reminded the Board that this issue was considered in the last cycle of meetings by the Joint Assembly and Executive Board. The focus of discussion at both meetings was on the definition of eligible homes to count towards the 1,000 additional homes. Reflecting current circumstances and the extensive discussion by Joint Assembly and Executive Board Members previously, Mrs Hunt explained that it was appropriate to interpret the City Deal agreement to count the affordable housing on sites coming forward in the rural area as exceptions to the normal Local Plan policies. The following definition was therefore proposed:

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

She felt that this revised definition reflected the Assembly and Board’s aspiration to follow local expectations at the time of the Deal’s consideration that homes were affordable homes, as per the majority of homes delivered through rural exception site policy.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that the Joint Assembly had considered this report at its meeting on 25 August 2016. Following extensive debate and discussion, the Joint Assembly had:

- (a) **NOTED** progress towards delivery as set out in paragraph 18 of the report.
- (b) **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board endorses the approach to monitoring as outlined in paragraphs 11 to 23 of the report.
- (c) **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board:
 - (i) treats as the same figure of 33,500, the housing supply (both through actual housing completions and through predicted completions from permissions, allocations and windfalls) required in the submitted Local Plans for Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, and the commitment in the City Deal agreement;
 - (ii) defines the City Deal agreement on affordable housing as follows:

“All affordable homes (as defined by the National Planning Policy Framework) constructed on rural exception sites, and on sites not allocated for development in the local plans and outside of a defined settlement boundary.”
 - (iii) requests that due consideration be given to the housing needs of local people;

- (iv) requires Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council to identify and record eligible planning permissions and completions, and the forecast and actual years in which they are built, as set out in Appendix 1 of the report (Figure 2), detailing also the cumulative total so that the delivery of the 1,000 additional homes can be identified.

Councillor Bridget Smith, Member of the Joint Assembly and South Cambridgeshire District Councillor, said that it was imperative that the definition was as close to the principles originally signed up to as possible, particularly in respect of meeting local need. She highlighted that another option could be to state that the objective set out in the original agreement was no longer achievable due to the significant changes that had occurred since the City Deal document was signed. She reiterated the original intention that these additional houses were for local people, emphasising that she would be extremely concerned if this aspect was lost.

Councillor Burkitt supported the adoption of the definition as set out in (ii) above, but queried how the Partnership could get the Government, who were ultimately monitoring progress, to also agree to this as an acceptable definition. In response, Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, informed Members she and Stephen Kelly, Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development at Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils, were meeting with the Government's representative in respect of the City Deal shortly where this issue would be discussed. Councillor Burkitt requested that a record of that meeting be made available to Members of the Board, which Tanya Sheridan agreed to provide.

Councillor Burkitt, referring to the graph appended to the report, also felt that future monitoring reports and associated appendices should focus more on the delivery of the 1,000 additional homes, to include a differential of those that were in rural exception sites and those other sites not included in Local Plans. He felt that this would provide the Board with a more useful way of monitoring progress. Mr Kelly confirmed that this request would be taken into account for future monitoring reports.

Councillor Burkitt also raised the cycle by which monitoring reports should be submitted back to the Board, opting for quarterly rather than six-monthly. Councillor Herbert agreed to discuss this issue with Councillor Burkitt outside of the meeting.

Councillor Ian Bates sought assurance that the definition adopted by the Board would satisfy the Government when performance against this objective was measured, but outlined his support for the definition as set out in (ii) above.

Mark Reeve asked how the City Deal Partnership would enable delivery of the 1,000 additional homes, rather than monitor progress. He suggested that this aspect of the objective be considered at a future meeting. Mr Kelly responded by saying that lots of things were being undertaken by City Deal partners to proactively facilitate the development of additional units and welcomed the opportunity to set this out in more detail as part of a future report to the Board.

The Executive Board:

- (a) **ENDORSED** the approach to monitoring set out in paragraphs 11 to 23 of the report.
- (b) **NOTED** progress towards delivery as set out in paragraph 18 of the report.

- (c) **AGREED** that it treats as the same figure of 33,500, the housing supply (both through actual housing completions and through predicted completions from permissions, allocations and windfalls) required in the submitted Local Plans for Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, and the commitment in the City Deal agreement.
- (d) **AGREED** to define the City Deal agreement on affordable housing as follows:

"All affordable homes (as defined by the National Planning Policy Framework) constructed on rural exception sites, and on sites not allocated for development in the local plans and outside of a defined settlement boundary."
- (e) **AGREED** that due consideration be given to the housing needs of local people;
- (f) **REQUIRED** Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council to identify and record eligible planning permissions and completions, and the forecast and actual years in which they are built, as set out in Appendix 1 of the report (Figure 2), detailing also the cumulative total so that the delivery of the 1,000 additional homes can be identified.

10. CAMBRIDGE PROMOTIONS AGENCY UPDATE

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, presented a report which provided an update on the progress and direction of the Cambridge Promotion Agency.

It was noted that whilst the Agency was making a positive difference, it was unlikely to become self-sustaining financially within the next year. No funding contribution had been received by the Local Enterprise Partnership or University to date and visiting investors did not expect to make financial contributions to the Agency on the way in, partly due to the fact that they were entertained lavishly in other competing regions.

Mark Reeve referred to a meeting of the Joint Assembly Local Enterprise Partnership Members that was scheduled to take place on 5 September 2016 and felt that further dialogue with the Local Enterprise Partnership and the Cambridge Promotions Agency would be useful in order to discuss possible expansion beyond its current remit. Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, welcomed such a meeting.

It was noted that the investment already put into the Agency by the City Deal Partnership had been provided through the New Homes Bonus contributions of the three partner Councils. Councillor Burkitt referred to the minutes of the meeting of the Board held on 6 March 2015, when the decision regarding this investment was made, and highlighted that it had been stated at that meeting that no further investment would be necessary. He therefore concluded that contributions from the City Deal were likely to end after the two year period of the initial investment.

The Executive Board **NOTED** the update report and **REQUESTED** a meeting involving a representative of the Board, the Cambridge Promotions Agency and the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership to discuss the future of the Agency.

11. CITY DEAL RISK MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

Consideration was given to a report which provided the Executive Board with an opportunity to agree a Risk Management Framework to apply across the City Deal Programme.

Aaron Blowers, City Deal Project Manager, presented the report and outlined the proposed key principles of the Framework, noted as follows:

- separate strategic and project-specific risk management, allowing detailed risks to be managed at a detailed level and strategic risks to be managed at a strategic level, with cascading and escalation between the two;
- Strategic Risk Register to be owned by the Executive Board, advised by the Programme Board as the senior officer management group;
- quarterly Strategic Risk Register reporting to the Executive Board and Joint Assembly.

Mr Blowers emphasised that risk management had been taking place in the City Deal Programme since its inception, but that this had been undertaken without the guidance of a single point of reference document resulting in ad hoc reporting arrangements. Adopting a City Deal Risk Management Framework therefore provided robust guidance to officers managing risks across the Programme, including implementing a process of escalating and cascading risks that reflected good programme and project management discipline.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that the Assembly had recommended approval of the draft Risk Management Framework. He added, however, that he only saw the need for the Joint Assembly, as a distinct from the Board, to consider the Strategic Risk Register annually but had requested that consideration be given to specific risks on a by exception only basis should they be new red risks or significantly increased risks.

Discussion ensued on the frequency of reports back to the Board in respect of risk management, with some Members preferring quarterly and some Members opting for six-monthly. It was agreed that reports should be received by the Board on a six monthly basis, but with the same provision as agreed by the Joint Assembly with regard to reports by exception should they be new red risks or significantly increased risks.

The Executive Board:

- (a) **APPROVED** the draft Risk Management Framework, to apply across the City Deal Programme.
- (b) **AGREED** to receive reports on the City Deal strategic risk management on a six-monthly basis and would otherwise consider risks only by exception should they be new red risks or significantly increased risks.

12. 2016/17 QUARTER 1 FINANCIAL MONITORING REPORT

The Executive Board considered a report which provided the Board with the financial monitoring position for the period ending 31 July 2016 in respect of the City Deal Programme.

Sarah Heywood, Head of Finance and Performance at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report and highlighted a request at the Joint Assembly meeting held on 25 August 2016 for more detail to be added to future reports regarding changes in costs and any slippage in scheme delivery. She confirmed that this would be reflected in future reporting.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, noted the table in paragraph 4.2.3 of the report which outlined the actual expenditure incurred as at the end of July. He

understood that some money had been spent which was not reflected in the table, but it was reported that some invoices had not yet been received and so could not be accounted for in this table for actual expenditure.

Councillor Francis Burkitt asked for clarity over the amount of New Homes Bonus available to the City Deal each year and how much of this funding had already been spent. Sarah Heywood reported that this information would be included in a financial strategy reported scheduled for consideration at the Executive Board on 10 November 2016. It was agreed that the Forward Plan would be amended to reflect that the Board would receive both a financial monitoring report and the financial strategy report at its meeting on 10 November 2016.

The Executive Board **NOTED** the financial position as at 31 July 2016.

The Meeting ended at 4.55 pm
