GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL EXECUTIVE BOARD

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board held on
Thursday, 3 March 2016 at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board:

Councillor Lewis Herbert	Cambridge City Council (Chairman)
Councillor Ian Bates	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Francis Burkitt	South Cambridgeshire District Council
John Bridge OBE	Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership
Professor Nigel Slater	University of Cambridge

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

Councillor Tim Bick	Cambridge City Council and Chairman of the Joint Assembly
Councillor Roger Hickford	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Kevin Price	Cambridge City Council

Officers/advisors:

Andrew Limb	Cambridge City Council
Mike Davies	Cambridgeshire County Council
Graham Hughes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Chris Malyon	Cambridgeshire County Council
Jeremy Smith	Cambridgeshire County Council
Stuart Walmsley	Cambridgeshire County Council
Aaron Blowers	City Deal Partnership
Beth Durham	City Deal Partnership
Tanya Sheridan	City Deal Partnership
Dan Clarke	Connecting Cambridgeshire Partnership
Alex Colyer	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Graham Watts	South Cambridgeshire District Council

1. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

Councillor Francis Burkitt was **ELECTED** as Vice-Chairman of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Steve Count (Cambridgeshire County Council). Councillor Ian Bates was in attendance as his substitute.

3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 15 January 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Professor Nigel Slater, representative of the University of Cambridge, declared that the University owned land in respect of the A428/A1303 transport infrastructure improvement scheme in relation to minute number 10.

5. QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

The following questions by members of the public, together with responses from Members of the Board or officers, were noted:

1) Question by Nichola Harrison

Nichola Harrison asked whether the Executive Board would arrange for a public consultation in respect of the Environmental Design Guide for the City Deal and, if not, an explanation of the reasons why.

Councillor Ian Bates, representing Cambridgeshire County Council, made the point that national and local guidelines already existed for this important issue, which would be built upon in producing the City Deal's Design Guide. Nichola Harrison, in response, said that the public wanted to see a comprehensive and cohesive local guidance document and that they deserved to have an input into its development.

It was noted that a report on the City Deal's Environmental Design Guide would be submitted to the Joint Assembly and subsequently the Executive Board in due course.

2) Questions by Robin Heydon

Robin Heydon set out the Cambridge Cycling Campaign's support for the Chisholm Trail and sought for the route to be officially named as the Chisholm Trail, with necessary street signage along the route being included such that the name could be placed onto maps as a proper road name. He also outlined concerns that, whilst some fairly reasonable schemes were being proposed for the bits between the junctions, there were no good proposals being suggested for the junctions themselves. Mr Heydon said that the Campaign would like to propose a different approach to junction design to that of the consultants and asked whether current traffic volumes and movements for cars, bicycles and people walking at junctions within Cambridge could be published.

Mr Heydon also asked when an open debate would commence about the benefits of traffic demand management through fiscal mechanisms. He was of the opinion that the revenue raised could help subsidise bus and rail services and vastly improve conditions for people walking and cycling in Cambridge.

Graham Hughes, Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, said that the Council often did share the data it collected and that he would be happy to share any data as and when it became available. He made the point, however, that the Council did not gather data on all junctions in Cambridge.

In terms of cross-city cycling and the inadequacy of junctions, Mr Hughes reminded Mr Heydon that the needs of all users had to be balanced within the resources available, but said that City Deal partners were trying to get that as right as they could.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, reminded Mr Heydon that a report on the City Centre Access Study, which would pick up issues such as traffic demand management, was scheduled to be submitted for consideration by the Board at its meeting in June.

Officers agreed to provide a written response to Mr Heydon's question regarding the name of the route for inclusion with the minutes for this meeting. The officer response is set out below:

"The County Council has confirmed that an appropriate name for the route would be 'The Chisholm Trail', given the longstanding commitment to its delivery by Jim Chisholm."

3) Question by Nick Burfield

Nick Burfield had circulated a letter on behalf of Paul Donno, Chairman of the Haverhill Chamber of Commerce, in respect of the A1307 Haverhill to Cambridge scheme. The letter set out a number of concerns it had in respect of the consultant's report, such as:

- the report totally discounting any growth planned in Haverhill until 2031;
- under-predicting current A1307 use and no growth in future traffic flows on the road;
- vastly reduced benefit cost ratio of dualling the A1307 Haverhill to Cambridge due to poor and incorrect data input into the model.

He therefore asked what the Board and City Deal partners would do to correct the report evidence to ensure correct conclusions and help mitigate the negative impact the report currently had on the Haverhill Chamber-led national campaign to fully dual the A1307.

Councillor Herbert said that some of the issues raised by the question would be addressed prior to the commencement of the initial consultation in respect of this scheme.

Mr Hughes responded by clarifying that the model had taken account of growth but the way the model had been used in the context of the wider scheme was the reasoning behind the way in which the findings were set out in the consultant's report. He confirmed that officers would be happy to investigate this issue further and emphasised that the A1307 needed addressing.

Councillor Bates reflected on a recent meeting he and other City Deal partners had held with representatives of the Chamber of Commerce. He thanked Mr Burfield for a useful meeting which provided positive challenges from the Chamber and business community, resulting in positive outcomes, and was keen for this relationship to continue in the development of the scheme.

4) Questions by Hans Hagen and Claire Tripp

Hans Hagen provided a letter on behalf of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus in respect of the M11 Junction 11 slip road, setting out statistical information on the anticipated growth in employee numbers in 2017/18. Principally, employee numbers at a number of key sites were expected to increase substantially over the next year and the numbers of patients and visitors travelling through the site throughout the day would increase not only

as a result of the move of Papworth Hospital and AstraZeneca but also because of the expansion of health and research services by all Cambridge Biomedical Campus partners. His letter addressed some objections to the proposed slip road at the meeting of the Joint Assembly on 12 February 2016 and made the point that this was the only City Deal project seeking to address this significant problem in a timely fashion. He informed the Executive Board that Cambridge Biomedical Campus partners would be prepared to run any project to assist with this scheme and asked that the proposals be put forward.

Claire Tripp presented statistical information in relation to the new Papworth Hospital due to open in 2018 on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. She said that the majority of staff working at Papworth lived to the North West and South West of the Campus who would have significant time added to their journeys as a result of the move due to congestion. A number of staff had indicated that they would use other forms of travel to improve their journey to work, which included the Madingley Road Park and Ride. Claire Tripp also made the point that, in addition to staff transferring to the new Hospital, so too would approximately 70,000 outpatients and 25,000 inpatients in 2018, with patients and their visitors requiring access to the site.

Mr Hughes responded by saying that the recommendation in the report scheduled for consideration later at this meeting was to progress with the scheme. He highlighted, however, that Highways England would need to give its consent to any scheme as it owned the road, and also made the point that there was currently no indication that any buses would use the route if it was built. Mr Hughes reminded the Board that the proposal for this slip road was for a public transport only route, with any proposal to extend this to use by all traffic being highly unlikely to be supported by Highways England.

5) Question by Barbara Taylor

Barbara Taylor reflected on the recent consultation which called for suggestions to address congestion in Cambridge. She felt this was noticeable for the absence of any proposals to reduce the impact of the City Centre as the primary bottleneck preventing free movement of traffic across the centre of the City. She asked whether the Executive Board would stop work on any other measures until it had addressed this crucial contributory element to congestion in Cambridge.

Councillor Herbert said that the Executive Board's position was that it believed in citywide measures and projects on specific routes to tackle congestion in Cambridge, which would be delivered through specific transport infrastructure improvement schemes on key routes in and around the city as well as the inclusion of additional traffic management measures. He said that the City Centre Access Study would be submitted to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board at their June meetings which would provide more information on some of the ideas put forward as part of the call for evidence.

6) Questions by Michael Bond

Michael Bond referred to the recent meeting of the Executive Board which launched the consultation on the Western Orbital scheme, saying it left him with the impression that it appeared to be an ill-thought through measure that lacked any rationale for linking to the destinations commuters actually wanted to reach. He asked whether the Executive Board would arrange for proper consideration of this proposal in its strategic context that actively involved residents as well as commercial, academic and single-issue groups.

Mr Bond also referred to previous consultations on the A14 and proposals put forward by Old Chesterton Residents' Association to eliminate local traffic from the A14 by creating a local feeder road around the north and east of the city. He saw this as a complimentary

proposal to a properly defined Western Orbital road and asked the Board to make it part of wider consultation he had asked for.

Mr Hughes responded by saying that the eastern relief road was a very different issue to that of the Western Orbital, with one of the main purposes of the Western Orbital being to ensure that people did not have to go through the City centre to get to the other side of Cambridge. He reminded the Board that there would be a huge amount of consultation on the scheme as it developed, with significant local consultation planned as part of each City Deal transport infrastructure improvement scheme.

7) Question by Richard Taylor

Richard Taylor noted that the three partner Councils had agreed to delegate powers to the Executive Board to the extent that the Board required them to in order to pursue its objectives and that Cambridgeshire County Council was in the process of clarifying which powers it considered had been delegated to the Board. He asked whether the Executive Board expected similar clarity over which powers Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council had delegated. Mr Taylor suggested that further clarity be given as to which powers the Executive Board considered that it held and which powers it intended to exercise in relation to particular schemes and circumstances, citing tree felling as an example of where it was currently unclear which authority or body had ultimate decision-making power.

Mr Hughes said that a clear list of delegations would be published on the City Deal website. He explained that the delegated powers behind tree felling and tree protection were quite complicated and was unable at 24 hour's notice to provide a comprehensive response, but agreed to respond to Mr Taylor on the issue directly as well as include this in the list of delegations to be published on the website.

8) Questions by Robin Pellew

Robin Pellew was unable to attend the meeting, but his below questions and points were noted:

- Cambridge Past, Present and Future remained supportive of the Chisholm Trail. It sought clarification from the Executive Board that the final decision on the exact route for the section between Newmarket Road and River Cam crossing would not be made until the impact assessments had been completed both for the curtilage of the Grade 1 Leper Chapel and for the ecology of the Leper Chapel Meadows;
- Cambridge Past, Present and Future was relived to hear that the City Deal had excluded any plans, concepts or options for a new cross-country bus lane over the Gog Magog Downs. He therefore asked for reassurance that all further consultancy contracts for transport and engineering projects would include an environmental brief, based on the environmental design guidelines that were currently being prepared.

Members of the Board noted the issues raised in the questions, both of which would be considered as separate items later at this meeting.

9) Questions by Lynn Hieatt

Lynn Hieatt asked for publication of the briefing documents that were sent to the consultants for each of the City Deal reports commissioned to date.

She also asked about the County Council's recent decision to delegate more powers to the Executive Board and asked when more details around these delegations and the safeguards referred to as part of that decision would be made available.

Councillor Herbert said that a written response to this question would be provided to Lynn Hieatt, setting out the details of the Executive Board's delegated powers.

10) Question by Councillor Tony Orgee

Councillor Tony Orgee, elected Member of both Cambridgeshire County Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, asked what impact on congestion in respect of the A1307 the following high-level proposals were expected to have:

- a Park and Ride site in the general area of Fourwentways;
- an off-line rapid transit route between the general area of Fourwentways and the southern side of Cambridge;
- a rapid transit route running south of the built-up area of Cambridge between the Babraham Park and Ride site and the Addenbrooke's Biomedical Campus.

Mr Hughes reminded Members of the Board that this was a very early stage of this particular transport infrastructure improvement scheme with potential options having been identified as concepts which, if accepted, would go forward as part of an initial public consultation. It was difficult to say absolutely what the impact would be as the details surrounding the scheme still needed to be determined, which would take account of the significant public consultation programmed to be undertaken as part of the scheme's development.

Councillor Herbert reiterated the conceptual nature of the scheme at this stage, but noted the significant points that Councillor Orgee had made.

11) Question by Angela Chadwyck-Healey

Angela Chadwyck-Healey asked for clarification of the expenditure table at Appendix A in the budget report with regard to the 'Madingley Road bus priority' project and an explanation as to why the expenditure had been categorised in this way when a decision on the specific route had not yet been made. She also asked whether the City Deal Executive Board was committed to consultation with the public on the options relating to the scheme, requesting that the consultant's reports and outline business cases, as set out in the report regarding the item on the A428/A1303, could be finalised and published on the City Deal website by 1 July 2016 to allow residents to provide any comments.

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, explained that the titles for projects used in the budget report were historical and emphasised that all options were still very much open for consideration. The cost of schemes was only indicative at this stage but funding had to be allocated. This allocation would be reviewed and amended as the scheme developed, in line with whatever scheme was eventually adopted.

12) Question by Wendy Blythe

Wendy Blythe asked why not one of the many residents' groups in Cambridge had been invited to the Local Liaison Forum meeting due to be held in the coming week to discuss the recent A428 bus lane consultations. She noted that Parish Councils and other local politicians had been invited but felt that residents too should be able to have their say and highlighted that the up-coming meeting clashed with a long-scheduled annual forum

meeting of city Residents' Association groups with the City Council. Wendy Blythe therefore asked that the invitation to this meeting be broadened and the meeting rescheduled.

Mr Hughes explained that the County Council had used Local Liaison Forums on a number of transport infrastructure schemes in the past, with the point of them being to act as a forum for issues to be raised as and when they occurred for local Councillors and key stakeholders, offering an opportunity for informal dialogue with officers. It was noted that the proposal for the Local Liaison Forums was that elected Members should decide which stakeholders to invite for subsequent meetings rather than officers determine attendance.

Councillor Herbert said that future meetings would seek to avoid any such clashes with meetings of stakeholder groups, such as Residents' Associations.

Councillor Bates reminded the Executive Board that Highways England also used Local Liaison Forums in this manner and were not solely established by the County Council.

13) Question by Councillor Susan van de Ven

Councillor Susan van de Ven, elected Member of Cambridgeshire County Council, provided the Executive Board with an update on the A10 cycle scheme. She reported that the Melbourn to Royston segment of the A10 cycle scheme remained unfunded and reflected on the significant work that companies such as AstraZeneca were doing to encourage model shift and promote cycling. Councillor van de Ven asked the Executive Board to consider including this segment of the scheme in tranche one of the City Deal programme.

Councillor Herbert reported that he had met with Councillor van de Ven and Councillor Francis Burkitt on this issue and had agreed that a report would be submitted to the Executive Board in June 2016.

6. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE JOINT ASSEMBLY

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, presented his report on the recommendations and key issues raised further to the meeting of the Assembly held on 12 February 2016.

Councillor Bick highlighted those public questions that were asked and answered at the meeting which did not relate to any items on the agenda for the meeting, as set out in his report, which included questions regarding the assessment of CO2 emissions and demand management.

It was agreed that Councillor Bick would present the Joint Assembly's recommendations in relation to items on the Executive Board's agenda at the relevant stage of the meeting.

The Executive Board **NOTED** the report by the Chairman of the Joint Assembly.

7. GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL FINANCIAL MONITORING

Consideration was given to a report which provided the Executive Board with the City Deal Programme's financial monitoring position for the period ending 31 January 2016.

Chris Malyon, Chief Finance Officer at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report and referred Members to the summary of expenditure against the profiled budget for the period ending 31 January 2016. The following further points were noted:

- an appointment had been made to the Strategic Communications Manager vacancy, with the successful candidate, Beth Durham, having commenced her new role on 29 February 2016;
- the Housing Development Agency would be operational from 1 April 2016 and Alan Carter, Head of Strategic Housing at Cambridge City Council, had been appointed as its Managing Director.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that the Assembly had noted this report at its meeting on 12 February 2016.

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

8. GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL PARTNERSHIP BUDGET 2016/17

The Executive Board considered a report setting out the Greater Cambridge City Deal programme and operational proposed budgets for the 2016/17 financial year. It also provided the Board with an opportunity to consider the continued pooling of New Homes Bonus for 2016/17 and how unallocated resources should be utilised.

Chris Malyon, Chief Finance Officer at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report and highlighted the operational budget which set out the expenditure required to support the City Deal Programme. He highlighted two specific issues in relation to housing and intelligent mobility, as follows:

- there were significant stresses in the Greater Cambridge Housing market and a small amount of funding was sought to better understand the demands and to define distinct housing products that could potentially meet this need. Funding was also sought to develop new partnership models to tackle these issues. Once these studies had been carried out, they may indicate opportunities for further work and investment to tackle housing market issues, as well as create an improved supply chain;
- running in parallel with the existing hard infrastructure schemes which formed part of the City Deal programme, there was an opportunity to establish a workstream to deliver the first steps towards intelligent mobility with four interlinked work packages. These were in addition to the 'Smart City Platform' proposal.

Mr Malyon reported on the City Deal's pooled resource and stated that, although the New Homes Bonus position had been clarified for the 2016/17 financial year, there was uncertainty over the future of the funding stream. In agreeing the projected operational budget set out in the report, a sum of £7.8 million would remain uncommitted by the end of Tranche 1 of the City Deal Programme. He recommended that, given the uncertainly around the future of New Homes Bonus, it would be inappropriate for the Executive Board to consider making any commitments beyond the resource envelope that the City Deal had at its disposal. A briefing note on the New Homes Bonus, together with details of the Government's consultation into proposed changes to the funding stream, were appended to the report.

It was noted that the City Deal Programme Director, having been in post for a few months, had identified the resources required in order to effectively deliver the City Deal Programme, which had previously relied on officers from the three partner Councils supporting the City Deal in addition to their respective jobs. Further to a request made at the meeting of the Joint Assembly on 12 February 2016, further information was appended to the report on the 2016/17 programme co-ordination and communications budget, which included information on the City Deal Partnership's staffing structure.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, presented the Assembly's recommendations following consideration of this report at its meeting on 12 February 2016. The following points were noted:

- additional information on the programme co-ordination and communications budget and the City Deal Partnership's staffing structure had been requested by the Assembly, which had since been appended to the report for consideration by the Board as referred to above;
- discussion took place on the apparent slippage of some transport schemes, but it was noted at the meeting that start and finish times of construction did not necessarily coincide with payment schedules and that it was important not to identify slippage by spending projections. The Assembly had requested a reconciliation between the two;
- the Assembly noted that additional external funding sources would be required to deliver all of the projects included in Tranche 1 of the City Deal Programme. It had therefore requested that a broad expectation of potential sources for this funding be outlined, which Mr Malyon had agreed to provide. He made the point, however, that it would be detrimental to the Partnership's negotiating position if he set out specific amounts expected from developer contributions, which the Joint Assembly accepted.

The Joint Assembly supported the recommendations contained within the report, subject to the inclusion of the words 'subject to the inclusion of reconciliation in respect of the apparent slippage of some schemes' to recommendation (d) so that it read:

'The Executive Board approves the provisional profiling for the remainder of Tranche 1 of the programme, subject to the inclusion of reconciliation in respect of the apparent slippage of some schemes'.

Councillor Francis Burkitt, representing South Cambridgeshire District Council, sought clarity that the Board was being asked to approve the budget solely for 2016/17, with budgets for future years being indicative at this stage. Mr Malyon confirmed that this was correct and that the City Deal would set its budget for the following year on an annual basis, making the point that variations in-year could still occur if approved by the Board at the relevant time.

Councillor Ian Bates, representing Cambridgeshire County Council, noted the additional information that had been provided in respect of the staffing structure and welcomed the appointment of the Strategic Communications Manager. He felt that the requirement for better communications had consistently been an issue for the City Deal and this appointment would now address this.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, agreed that it was important for developer contributions and other sources of external funding to be identified and monitored. He also reflected on changes to the New Homes Bonus scheme following the Local Government Finance Settlement and said that the position would be much clearer at the conclusion of the Government's consultation. He proposed accepting the Joint Assembly's recommendation in respect of recommendation (d) in the report and also proposed that recommendation (f) be amended to request an update to Appendix A on the proposed City Deal Programme for the current financial year and the remaining four years of Phase 1 of the City Deal.

The Executive Board unanimously:

(a) **NOTED** the briefing note appertaining to the future of New Homes Bonus.

(b) **APPROVED** the budgetary provision for the 2016/17 operational budget, including the programme management budget as set out in the report.

(c) **REQUESTED** that more detailed proposals be brought forward in respect of the additional investment in Housing and Intelligent Mobility.

(d) **APPROVED** the provisional profiling for the remainder of Tranche 1 of the programme, subject to the inclusion of reconciliation in respect of the apparent slippage of some schemes.

(e) **AGREED** that the unallocated New Homes Bonus pooled resource be retained to facilitate the successful delivery of Phase 1 of the programme.

(f) **REQUESTED** a further report on the strategy for the redistribution of unallocated monies before the end of the year, to include an update on the proposed programme for the current financial year and the remaining four years of phase 1 of the City Deal, as set out in Appendix A of the report.

9. CAMBRIDGE AND SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLANS

The Executive Board considered a position statement clarifying the role that the City Deal had in supporting the delivery of the development strategy in the submitted Local Plans for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire.

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, presented the position statement which she said had been produced in partnership by both Councils as a result of representations made to the Local Plan consultation process that had very recently closed.

Councillor Francis Burkitt, representing South Cambridgeshire District Council, said that this was a very important and well written document, with paragraph 6 onwards making it clear what the City Deal's role was in this Local Plan context.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, asked why this position statement had not been reported to the meeting of the Assembly on 12 February 2016. Tanya Sheridan explained that she did not know that such a position statement would be necessary until after the Joint Assembly meeting had been held and that its consideration could not have been deferred to the next cycle of meetings of the Assembly and Board. It was noted that an explanatory email to this effect had been sent to all Members of the Joint Assembly.

The City Deal Executive Board unanimously **APPROVED** the position statement, as set out in the report.

10. A428/A1303 BETTER BUS JOURNEYS SCHEME - PUBLIC CONSULTATION OUTCOMES AND NEXT STEPS

The Executive Board considered a report which summarised the outcome of the consultation on high level options for bus and cycle infrastructure improvements along the Cambourne to Cambridge corridor.

Stuart Walmsley, Head of Major Infrastructure Delivery at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report and highlighted that the public consultation had generated significant public interest including 2193 survey responses, 8 letters and 123 email submissions and key stakeholder representations. A petition had also been received with over 3600 signatures opposing Option 1 South, with other responses outlining significant support for transport improvement along the corridor. He referred to background documents set out in the report which contained detailed analysis of the consultation responses and a summary of representations received.

A number of hybrid schemes, made up of aspects of the options originally published with the consultation, and some alternative options had been submitted as part of the process. A further piece of work would now commence to analyse these hybrid and alternative options from a technical perspective.

Mr Walmsley highlighted concerns expressed in the consultation responses regarding environmental impact and agreed that this was an important issue. He said that, as the scheme progressed to the next stage, issues relating to environmental impact would become much clearer, together with ways in which these could be mitigated.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that the Assembly at its meeting on 12 February 2016 had supported the recommendations contained within the report. The report stated that the consultation had been carried out in accordance with the consultation principles of Cambridgeshire County Council, but Members of the Assembly were not aware of these principles having been formally agreed or adopted. The Assembly therefore requested this as a future agenda item in order that the position could be clarified.

John Bridge, representing the Local Enterprise Partnership, requested more clarity over the percentages quoted in paragraph 21 of the report in respect of respondents' usual mode of transport. Mr Walmsley agreed to liaise directly with Mr Bridge outside of the meeting to provide an explanation.

Councillor Francis Burkitt, representing South Cambridgeshire District Council, felt that this consultation had been extremely successful with an excellent level of responses from members of the public. He said that the consultation had achieved what it set out to do in terms of engagement and seeking people's views and went on to read out a number of comments that had been submitted in favour of a scheme along this corridor. Councillor Burkitt took this opportunity to pay tribute to officers who had worked very hard on this piece of work.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, acknowledged that a number of hybrids and alternatives to the options presented in the consultation document had been received, which he welcomed. He also noted that the consultation principles of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Partnership would be considered at the next cycle of Joint Assembly and Executive Board meetings.

The Executive Board unanimously **NOTED** the responses to the consultation on the A428/A1303 bus infrastructure improvement scheme, including the alternative and hybrid options suggested, and **AGREED** to include these and other comments received in the ongoing development and assessment appraisal to allow the Board to select a recommended option or options in September 2016.

11. THE CHISHOLM TRAIL

The Executive Board considered a report which summarised the results of the consultation undertaken on the proposed route for the Chisholm Trail.

Stuart Walmsley, Head of Major Infrastructure Delivery at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report and stated that 1,457 responses had been received to the consultation, as well as ten additional letters. Over 90% of those responding supported some form of mostly off road walking and cycling route to link the north and south of the city. 86% supported the specific route and 84% said that they would 'probably or definitely use the route'. It was noted that most opposition appeared to be associated with the lengths north of Coldhams Common, particularly in respect of the impact on green space and proposed path sizes.

Mr Walmsley reported that the project team would continue to engage with landowners, stakeholders, interest groups and specialists, especially over key issues such as flood mitigation, ecology and heritage. He added, in particular, that the team was working closely with Cambridge Past, Present and Future in respect of the Leper Chapel and proposed subway.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that the Assembly at its meeting on 12 February 2016 had supported the recommendations contained within the report and was very supportive of the scheme. In discussing the scheme, reference was made to its economic benefit, particularly in respect of the business of a public speaker at the meeting specialising in urban delivery by bicycle. It was suggested that added economic benefit be carefully studied and evidenced to assist the evaluation of future such schemes. In terms of the necessary land acquisitions and ongoing negotiations with Network Rail, the Assembly had requested periodic progress reports.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, asked for clarity over the design of junctions on the route and how works would take place in terms of the expected pattern of delivery, such as whether it would be delivered as a single scheme or in stages. Mr Walmsley confirmed that there would be advanced works in some areas of the route and said that updates with more detail could be presented to the Executive Board at the relevant time. In terms of junctions, it was noted that, where possible, the use of subways would be incorporated into the scheme. He did envisage some problems with junctions in view of this being a spinal route through the City, but said that these would be dealt with as they came forward as part of the scheme's development. An update report would be submitted to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in June 2016.

The Executive Board unanimously:

(a) **NOTED** the results of the public consultation.

(b) **APPROVED** the submission of a planning application based on the widths and path types as set out in the report and the route proposed as shown in Plan 1 of the report.

(c) **SUPPORTED** the continuation of land negotiations.

(d) **APPROVED** the use Compulsory Purchase Orders if needed.

12. A1307 HAVERHILL TO CAMBRIDGE: APPROVAL TO CONSULT ON TRANSPORT IMPROVEMENT CONCEPTS

The Executive Board considered a report which set out the high level transport improvement concepts that had emerged from initial study work undertaken on the A1307 corridor.

Jeremy Smith, Head of Transport and Infrastructure Policy and Funding at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report. He said that further consideration had been given to the scheme since it was initially looked at in view of the changing development picture in the area. A more comprehensive look into traffic conditions, taking into account seasonal variation, would be necessary together with analysis of smaller parts of the route which could provide more impact. A summary of concepts for the scheme at this stage were set out in figure 2 of the report.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that the Assembly had considered this report at its meeting on 12 February 2016. In view of acknowledgement that a more comprehensive investigation would be necessary before it was advisable to discount major road interventions between the A11 and Haverhill, the Joint Assembly supported the recommendations contained within the report but recommended the removal of reference to major road interventions in recommendation (b). A number of points raised by Members of the Assembly, including the impact of growth in Sawston, the need for clear diagrams as part of consultation documentation and not losing focus on cycling and walking provision, were set out in Councillor Bick's report. The importance of relating bus infrastructure investment to the way operators would run services on the infrastructure was also discussed by the Assembly and a request was made for officers to facilitate a meeting with representatives of bus operators to help better understand the possibility of obtaining service commitments.

Councillor Ian Bates, representing Cambridgeshire County Council, was pleased that representatives of Essex and Suffolk had engaged in this project and welcomed this wider partnership approach. He also made the point that the A505 was an extremely busy road and thought, in looking at the corridor, that it would be worth considering this as part of the consultation exercise. Councillor Francis Burkitt, representing South Cambridgeshire District Council, agreed and said that a lot of Sawston residents would want the village of Sawston to be included as part of this scheme.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, supported the sentiments of the amendment to recommendation (b) proposed by the Joint Assembly, but proposed a revised amendment to include the words 'and commissions with partners, further traffic counts and modelling assessments of the case for improvement to the A1307 all the way to Haverhill'. This was supported.

The Executive Board unanimously:

(a) **NOTED** the findings summarised in this report and set out in the Draft Concepts Report.

(b) **DISCOUNTED** from further consideration as part of the Greater Cambridge City Deal reopening the railway to Haverhill and providing a Busway all the way to Haverhill and **AGREED** to commission, with partners, further traffic counts and modelling assessments of the case for improvements to the A1307 all the way to Haverhill.

(c) **APPROVED** for public consultation the illustrative concepts set out in this report to provide improved Park and Ride linked to Bus Rapid Transit between Fourwentways and Cambridge, and Cycling and Walking measures along the corridor.

(d) **AGREED** to receive a report recommending a preferred set of measures, informed by public consultation and the conclusion of appraisal and assessment work in late 2016.

13. SOUTHBOUND BUS PRIORITY SLIP ROAD - JUNCTION 11, M11

The Executive Board considered a report which set out a high level risk assessment on the issues that impacted the inclusion of a southbound bus priority slip road at Junction 11 of the M11 in Tranche 1 of the City Deal Programme.

Stuart Walmsley, Head of Major Infrastructure Delivery at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report and highlighted a number of issues and risks that had been identified. These were set out in the report and included the fact that:

- Highways England would need to give its consent to any proposal;
- any proposal would need to cross land currently under planning consideration for new housing and leisure facilities;
- there was currently no bus route running off Junction 11 of the M11;
- any potential wider scheme, such as the Western Orbital corridor, would be closely linked to infrastructure at Junction 11.

Mr Walmsley emphasised that the proposal was based on a scheme for use by public transport only, with any proposal for use by all traffic being highly likely to be refused by Highways England.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that the Assembly had considered this report at its meeting on 12 February 2016. He reported that the majority of Joint Assembly Members considered that such a scheme could only deliver value as part of a wider Western Orbital scheme and therefore recommended that the Executive Board integrated the scheme into the developing Western Orbital proposals to ensure that it was considered within this wider strategic context.

Councillor Francis Burkitt, representing South Cambridgeshire District Council, was keen for the Board to proceed with the further development of the proposal to assess its final viability. John Bridge, representing the Local Enterprise Partnership, supported this and reported that businesses were very keen to use such a route and therefore did not want to see the project delayed.

Councillor Ian Bates, representing Cambridgeshire County Council, highlighted that Highways England at this stage had still not indicated its consent towards such a project and it was also not clear whether any bus operators would be willing to run services on the route. He understood people wanting the project to proceed and said, in view of the upcoming consultation on the Western Orbital corridor scheme, that the two schemes had to interlink.

Professor Nigel Slater, representing the University of Cambridge, said that agreeing to further work, including further discussions with Highways England, would not commit the Executive Board to anything substantial so supported progressing with the further assessment work.

Mr Bridge was very keen to ensure that this project was delivered within Tranche 1 of the City Deal Programme. Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, understood Mr Bridge's preference to include this in Tranche 1 but felt that, at this stage, the Executive Board should not make such a commitment. He said, however, that this did not mean the scheme could not be delivered as part of Tranche 1 of the Programme.

Councillor Bick made the point that, in agreeing to progress with the assessment of the scheme's final viability, resources would be spent in undertaking that work. He therefore asked whether there would be a limit imposed on the resources available. Councillor Herbert responded by saying that regular updates on progress and the budget for this project would be made, but agreed that a specific budget should be allocated for this aspect of the development work.

The Executive Board:

(a) **NOTED** the outcome of the high level risk assessment and the progress made on the proposal for a bus only slip road at Junction 11 of the M11.

(b) **AGREED** to proceed with the further development of the proposal to assess its final viability.

14. SMART CAMBRIDGE - 'SMART TECHNOLOGY CITY MANAGEMENT PLATFORM'

Consideration was given to a report which set out the more detailed investment proposal behind the Executive Board's outline approval in November 2015 to invest up to £280,000 to implement a Smart Technology City Management Platform.

Andrew Limb, Head of Corporate Strategy at Cambridge City Council, presented the report and highlighted the main components of the project as being:

- a data network, specifically designed to support 'Internet of Things' technology;
- a data hub, consisting of a software platform that would collate, combine and process a range of data sets to provide additional insights, information and visualisation as well as application development for City Deal partners and other third parties;
- an array of sensors that would enable automated detection and monitoring of a range of measures including air quality, traffic, cycle and pedestrian movements around the city.

Mr Limb made reference to an informal presentation on the Smart Technology City Management Platform which had been given to Executive Board and Assembly Members prior to the meeting of the Joint Assembly on 12 February 2016. Dan Clarke, Future Digital Programme Manager at the Connecting Cambridgeshire Partnership, provided the Executive Board with an overview of the presentation, setting out the following aspects of the project:

- the Smart Cities Strategy, financing and resources;
- Smart City solutions in respect of transport, environmental management, health and care and smart living;
- the architecture required to implement the Smart Cities Strategy;
- an assessment of user needs following market research undertaken with experts and business representatives in terms of characteristics amongst the travelling public in the United Kingdom;

- an overview of the Greater Cambridge Smart City Management Platform and the Data Hub;
- initial applications that could be introduced to improve mobility experience and encourage modal shift.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that the Assembly had considered this report at its meeting on 12 February 2016 where it was welcomed and supported.

Councillor Francis Burkitt, representing South Cambridgeshire District Council, was very supportive of this project in principle but was disappointed that more of the information provided as part of the presentation had not been included in the agenda pack for this meeting in order to better promote what the Smart Cities project was seeking to achieve. He also felt that a business plan for the project was missing from the report and asked that this be provided alongside an update report to the July meeting of the Executive Board.

John Bridge, representing the Local Enterprise Partnership, supported these comments and wanted to see an assessment of what was expected to be achieved as a result of the investment. He was also keen to understand who owned the various aspects of the hardware or software that was being purchased and how the project was being resourced. Mr Limb explained that this project was slightly different to the housing and transport workstreams of the City Deal in that it was not being delivered solely by traditional, dedicated Council teams, but was a collaborative endeavour with officers from partner Councils working with input from Cambridge University, Anglia Ruskin University and key business partners with oversight from the City Deal Partnership. He also highlighted that with innovation came risk, accepting that the project involved cutting edge technology which was constantly changing. Officers confirmed that a business plan would accompany an update report to the Executive Board at its meeting in July.

Professor Nigel Slater, representing the University of Cambridge, reported that he had met with Ian Lewis, Director of Infrastructure Investment at the University of Cambridge, to discuss the opportunities that this project could provide. He was convinced that outcomes from this Smart Cities workstream would make a significant difference to the city of Cambridge and therefore gave it his full support.

The Executive Board:

(a) **APPROVED** the investment of £300,000 to develop a first stage 'smart technology city management platform' for Greater Cambridge.

(b) **REQUESTED** a progress report and Business Plan, to include outcomes, for consideration at the meeting of the Board scheduled to be held in July 2016.

15. CITY DEAL WORKSTREAM UPDATE

The Executive Board considered updates from each of the City Deal workstreams.

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, in presenting the document highlighted the following issues:

- a meeting of the Skills Sub-Group was scheduled to meet on Monday 7 March 2016;
- the Managing Director of the Housing Development Agency had been appointed;

- three consultations had recently closed for transport infrastructure improvement schemes and a good level of responses had been received for each.

The Executive Board **NOTED** the workstream update.

16. GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL FORWARD PLAN

The Executive Board gave consideration to the City Deal Forward Plan and noted the various additions as a result of decisions taken earlier at this meeting.

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

The Meeting ended at 4.52 p.m.
