



GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL JOINT ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly held on
Friday, 12 February 2016 at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly:

Councillor Tim Bick	Cambridge City Council (Chairman)
Councillor Roger Hickford	Cambridgeshire County Council (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Dave Baigent	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Kevin Price	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Noel Kavanagh	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Maurice Leeke	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Kevin Cuffley	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Bridget Smith	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Nick Wright	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Sir Michael Marshall	Marshall Group
Claire Ruskin	Cambridge Network
Andy Williams	AstraZeneca
Anne Constantine	Cambridge Regional College
Helen Valentine	Anglia Ruskin University
Dr John Wells	Cancer Research UK Cambridge Institute

Members of substitutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board in attendance:

Councillor Ian Bates	Cambridgeshire County Council
----------------------	-------------------------------

Officers/advisors:

Andrew Limb	Cambridge City Council
Mike Davies	Cambridgeshire County Council
Chris Malyon	Cambridgeshire County Council
Bob Menzies	Cambridgeshire County Council
Jeremy Smith	Cambridgeshire County Council
Stuart Walmsley	Cambridgeshire County Council
Aaron Blowers	City Deal Partnership
Tanya Sheridan	City Deal Partnership
Noelle Godfrey	Connecting Cambridgeshire Partnership
Adrian Cannard	Local Enterprise Partnership
Alex Colyer	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Graham Watts	South Cambridgeshire District Council

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman, took this opportunity to welcome Councillor Kevin Cuffley to his first meeting of the Joint Assembly as a representative of South Cambridgeshire District Council.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 17 December 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record, subject to an amendment to minute number 7 in relation to the unanimous decision to recommend the addition of a criterion to assess environmental impact and design, making it clear that this was proposed by Councillor Kevin Price and seconded by Councillor Francis Burkitt.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Roger Hickford declared a non-pecuniary interest in minute number 10 as he was Chairman of the A1307 Steering Group.

4. QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman, reported that a number of people had registered to speak in relation to specific items on the agenda for this meeting. He therefore proposed that those questions be put at the relevant item.

The following questions did not relate to any items on the agenda for this meeting and were therefore asked and answered at this stage of proceedings, as follows:

Question by Dr Anthony Eva

Dr Eva asked the Joint Assembly to:

- ensure that transport infrastructure plans were rigorously tested against required CO₂e emission reduction targets for 2030 and beyond, and, in particular;
- look in more detail as to whether planning assumptions about the Cambridge City transportation mix in 2031 were compatible with required CO₂e emission reductions through 2030 and beyond.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman, stated that the City Deal's strategy in terms of transport related schemes sought to promote walking, cycling and public transport as much as possible. He agreed with the sentiments of the question in terms of the fuel used for public service vehicles.

Bob Menzies, Director of Strategy and Development (Cambridgeshire County Council) agreed that this was an important issue and stated that the assessment of carbon emissions was a valid point. He confirmed that lots of work was ongoing with the introduction of cleaner buses in Cambridgeshire, an initiative that was seeing vast improvements in CO₂e emissions.

In terms of planning assumptions, it was noted that a report on demand management measures in the city centre was scheduled to be considered by the Executive Board in June 2016 and would include reference to this issue.

Question by Councillor Markus Gehring

Councillor Gehring asked the Joint Assembly why demand management measures suggested at the call for evidence sessions could not be included as part of the ongoing consultation processes for specific transport infrastructure schemes, where they could be of some use.

He also raised concerns regarding the quality of the diagrams included in the consultation document for the Western Orbital corridor scheme. This followed the publication of the results for the Madingley Road corridor scheme, which he felt had not excluded the least favourite options.

Mr Menzies said that the call for evidence was part of a high level consultation on demand management. He reminded those present that the City Deal Executive Board had agreed at the outset of confirming the Tranche 1 programme that it wanted to engage with people on transport infrastructure schemes. Schemes were therefore being consulted upon at early conceptual stages to enable people to put forward their views very early on in the process. Preferred routes could then be established, taking into account the outcomes of the initial consultation process and more detailed work which could then commence.

In terms of demand management, Mr Menzies emphasised that nothing put forward as part of the call for evidence sessions had been ruled out and that all options were being considered. He reminded Members of the Assembly, however, that some further work would need to be undertaken to better understand the consequences of implementing some of the options.

Question by Jim Chisholm

Mr Chisholm referred to the call for evidence sessions and transport infrastructure schemes in general and asked whether it would be better to spend a smaller sum on leading edge technology, which could provide a proven benefit, rather than on schemes that were likely to encourage more cars into the city.

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, gave an assurance that everything submitted as part of the call for evidence would be looked at, with the outcomes reported to the Executive Board in June 2016.

Mr Menzies confirmed that the call for evidence and demand management outcomes would be delivered in parallel, where necessary.

Question by Mike Sargeant

Mr Sargeant asked whether Members of the Joint Assembly would join him on a visit to Milton Road to see the issues that had arisen from residents as a result of the Milton Road transport infrastructure scheme consultation. He reported that particular concerns to residents were:

- loss of the residential nature of the road, including trees and verges;
- rat running through the area due to prevention of turns.

Councillor Bick invited Mr Sargeant to put forward his invitation to Members of the Joint Assembly outside of the meeting.

5. PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

6. GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL FINANCIAL MONITORING

Consideration was given to a report which provided the Joint Assembly 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 scheduled to commence the new role on 29 February 2016;
- the Housing Development Agency would be operational from 1 April 2016.

Sir Michael Marshall asked whether any analysis had been undertaken at this stage on the level of return or anticipated benefit from the City Deal investment.

Bob Menzies, Director of Strategy and Development at Cambridgeshire County Council, reported that, in respect of transport infrastructure schemes, as each scheme developed they would have their own business case in place which identified a range of benefits and costs. He reminded Members that these would be used by the Government as part of the City Deal Programme's trigger mechanism.

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the financial position as at 31 January 2016.

7. GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL PARTNERSHIP BUDGET 2016/17

The Joint Assembly 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 Assembly 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 uncertainty around the future of New Homes Bonus, it would be inappropriate for the Joint Assembly and 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 also highlighted that the level of funding received by Government for the first five years of the City Deal Programme, £100 million for Tranche 1, would be insufficient to cover the approximate £160 million of schemes included within it. Mr Malyon said that other funding streams, such as developer contributions, would need to be secured.

Discussion ensued by Members of the Assembly, further to which the following points were noted:

- consideration should be given to returning any unspent New Homes Bonus monies back to the three partner Councils. Mr Malyon responded by saying that this was an option the Executive Board could consider, although, in his view, he felt that it was too premature to make such a decision at this stage;
- there was a relatively high increase in budgets for central co-ordination and communications across 2016/17 and these costs should be kept to a minimum. It was noted that the Programme Director, having been in post for a few months, had identified the resources required in order to effectively deliver the programme which had previously relied on officers from the three partner Councils supporting the City Deal in addition to their respective jobs;
- there was an additional line in the budget for affordable housing, specifically for housing research. In view of the extensive experience both District Councils had in relation to the housing market, a question was asked as to what additional research may be necessary that the Council's officers would not be able to provide. Mr Malyon reported that the City Council had requested this additional piece of research, which was outside of the expertise that the Councils had at their disposal. The research would investigate new delivery models, given recent significant legislative changes, and establish their feasibility and practicality for the City Deal programme. A more detailed report on the outcomes of this specific investment would be reported into the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in due course;
- a more comprehensive explanation of the detail surrounding proposed spending in respect of the operational budget should be included. This was unanimously supported by the Assembly. Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, agreed that further information would be included in future reports and explained that the original £210,000 effectively paid for three posts. These were the Programme Director, the Project Manager and the Strategic Communications Manager. A further increase of £281,000 would enable the City Deal to hire a graduate trainee to work on the economic and housing aspects of the programme, to employ a project/communications support officer providing administrative support to the programme across the three Councils, as well as ensuring provision for legal and other professional advice that may be required at various stages of the programme. This additional funding would also provide a relatively small budget for strategic communications;

- anticipated external funding streams should be identified so that it was better understood where additional funding was coming from and how much it was likely to be. It was noted that a significant amount of external funding would be made available through developer contributions, such as through Section 106 Agreements or the Community Infrastructure Levy. Mr Malyon was reluctant to highlight the amount required through these funding streams as this could potentially negatively impact negotiations with developers. Various other grant funding opportunities would be available to the City Deal and, although there was no specific programme to share with the Assembly or Board at this stage, Mr Malyon agreed to set out a broad expectation of where that additional funding may come from;
- more information should be provided on the apparent slippage of some transport infrastructure schemes. Bob Menzies, Director of Strategy and Development at Cambridgeshire County Council, responded by explaining that the start and finish dates in the report related to construction rather than when schemes would be paid by. Transport infrastructure schemes were complex in terms of the comparison between construction finish dates and the date that a scheme finished being paid for. He cited examples of land transfers that sometimes took years to complete and in some cases were still ongoing once schemes had been completed and opened for use. In terms of the A1307 scheme, there had been an initial delay in the reporting cycle but it was noted that this should not delay the scheme in accordance with the originally anticipated delivery timescale. The Joint Assembly agreed that reconciliation in respect of the apparent slippage of some schemes should be made available to make this clearer.

The Joint Assembly **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board:

- (a) Noted the briefing note appertaining to the future of New Homes Bonus.
- (b) Approved the budgetary provision for the 2016/17 operational budget, subject to more information being made available on the further spending items, including the City Deal Programme's staffing structure.
- (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 Phase 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) Considered a further report on the strategy for the redistribution of unallocated monies before the end of the year.

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

The Joint Assembly 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.

Mr Walmsley said that this had been a very thorough piece of work which had provided significant engagement with members of the public at an early stage of this scheme. He reflected on the fact that officers had worked very closely with Parish Councils and said that this needed to continue.

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, adding that officers were exploring an engineering solution conscious of the fact that it was a green corridor. 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. Mr Walmsley emphasised that officers took environmental impact issues very seriously.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman, invited Lynn Hieatt to ask a question she had given notice of in relation to this item. She reflected on numerous complaints and criticisms of the consultation document in terms of perceived bias in the questions, absence of detail and a lack of clear invitation to put forward alternatives. In the comments and written submissions she said that there were 100 instances of the word 'misleading', 92 instances of the word 'biased' and 42 instances of the word 'flawed' and asked whether she had missed the section in the report that mentioned these perceived flaws. She added that it would be a positive message from the City Deal, and a step in improving the process in future to everyone's benefit, if some acknowledgement were to be added in the report that things went wrong with this consultation and asked whether this would be the case.

Mr Walmsley reiterated that this was a thorough piece of work which required a lot of engagement with stakeholders, interested parties and members of the public facilitated online and through social media, as well as through traditional means of consultation. He made the point that a number of alternative options had been submitted as part of the responses received. Mr Walmsley added that the consultation had provided people with an opportunity to put forward their views on a number of conceptual options, whether that meant supporting one or more of the options presented, amalgamating options into hybrids or putting forward alternative options. The Executive Board was keen to engage with people at an early stage of the process and Mr Walmsley was of the view that this consultation had worked well in that respect. Bob Menzies, Director of Strategy and Development at Cambridgeshire County Council, did not agree that the consultation was flawed or biased in any way and referred to lengthy correspondence that had occurred with regards to the points raised in the question. He reminded the Joint Assembly that this was a consultation where people could put forward their comments or views, not a referendum where people were being asked to vote for a specific option.

Councillor Kevin Price highlighted that the report stated the consultation had been undertaken in accordance with the consultation principles of the Greater Cambridge City Deal partnership. He questioned the consultation principles and asked whether the City Deal Executive Board had ever formally adopted them. Mr Menzies reported that the City Deal had adopted Cambridgeshire County Council's protocol, which may have been agreed in the Board's Shadow capacity prior to the formal establishment of the Executive Board. Councillor Bick suggested including this as an item for the next meeting of the Joint Assembly, with a view to formalising the approach.

Councillor Bridget Smith sought clarification as to whether 'do nothing' could be included as an option in future consultations for transport infrastructure schemes. She asked this question in view of the fact that Smart City proposals were seeking to reduce congestion which, if effective, could have a significant impact on the rate of congestion in their own right. Mr Menzies said that the Smart City proposals would be delivered as part of City Deal transport infrastructure schemes and could not be introduced as a single element. Schemes were seeking to address future use of the network, taking into account the significant anticipated growth in the number of people living and working in the Greater Cambridge area. He advised, therefore, that doing nothing would be significantly detrimental and delay implementation of a solution to the existing problem and problems that would occur in future years.

Councillor Smith also asked whether the options set out in future consultations could include an assessment of carbon emissions. Mr Menzies explained that a range of assessments, including that of carbon emissions, would be undertaken to inform the next stage of consultation in developing preferred options for the scheme.

Councillor Bick took this opportunity to thank all those who contributed to the consultation process.

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the responses to the consultation on the A428/A1303 bus infrastructure improvement scheme, including the alternative and hybrid options suggested and **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board includes 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.

9. THE CHISHOLM TRAIL

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

Mike Davies, Team Leader of Cycling Projects 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'. When broken down into sections, Mr Davies reported that there was support of over 83% for each of the five sections, with most support being shown for the length linking to the existing station. 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 Davies 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.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman, invited three members of the public who had given notice to put forward their questions in respect of this item. These were noted as follows:

Rob King

Mr King explained that he ran a group of local cycling businesses in the area, with the logistics arm specialising in urban deliveries by bicycle. He said that the Chisholm Trail on the route proposed would be hugely important in supporting his work, creating a new route through the heart of the City's business district and linking Addenbrooke's and the Science Park. He asked whether the Joint Assembly would support the adoption of quality cycling infrastructure and, particularly, the Chisholm Trail to ensure Cambridge was a world leading, modern, fit and active city ready for the challenges of the future.

Edward Leigh

On Edward Leigh's behalf, Lynn Hieatt read out a statement by Edward Leigh which fully endorsed the recommendation to proceed with building the Chisholm Trail. He hoped to see the City Deal bring forward many more similar schemes for connecting up Cambridge and its surrounding villages in a network of high quality cycle ways.

Chris Smith

Mr Smith was not in attendance to present his question, but Members noted his statement and question. He asked on what design the consultation had been made and felt that more scrutiny should be given to the scheme before any further approval was granted.

In discussing the content of the report and issues raised by public questions, the following points by Members of the Joint Assembly were noted:

- the cycles used by Mr King's business were quite large, weighing approximately a quarter of a tonne, so clarification was sought as to whether the route had been designed to accommodate vehicles such as this. Mr Davies confirmed that these vehicles, as well as motorised mobility vehicles, could be accommodated on the route;
- Mr King's logistics aspect of his business, in terms of undertaking urban deliveries by bicycle, provided a competitive advantage over road-based haulage operators. It was suggested that the added economic benefit in this context should be investigated further and potentially used as evidence to support the inclusion of more cycle schemes in future Tranches of the City Deal programme;
- in terms of reference to green space, Councillor Dave Baigent asked that officers made specific reference to the status of such areas in future reports, rather than using the rather generic term 'green space';
- part of the proposed route went through the Ridgeons site development. It was noted that this was a long-term aspiration, subject to discussions and negotiations with landowners, and that alternatives and temporary measures could be put in place;
- the proposed route was very dependent on land acquisitions, so it was suggested that the Joint Assembly should receive regular progress updates;
- Cambridge Past, Present and Future, in discussions with the Chairman, confirmed that the proposed route accommodated a concern it had originally raised in respect of the proximity of the route to the Leper Chapel.

Mr Davies reminded the Joint Assembly that approximately ten different landowners had been spoken to in respect of this scheme and the proposed route and at this stage verbal agreement had been reached with them all. Negotiations were also on-going with Network Rail, which he was seeking to progress as quickly as possible.

The Joint Assembly **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board:

- (a) Noted the results of the public consultation.
- (b) Gave approval to submit 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) Gave approval to use Compulsory Purchase Orders if needed.

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

The Joint Assembly 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, clarified that further work would therefore be required on major road interventions contrary to the below recommendation contained within the report to the Executive Board:

‘That the Executive Board discounts from further consideration as part of the Greater Cambridge City Deal reopening the railway to Haverhill, providing a Busway all the way to Haverhill or major road interventions.’

It was unanimously agreed that reference to discounting major road interventions should therefore be removed from the recommendation to the Executive Board.

Councillor Bick read out a question from Peter Wakefield, Chairman of Railfuture East Anglia, who had given notice of the intention to ask a question but was not present at the meeting. He asked which rail organisations City Deal partners had spoken to and what rail projects were being considered for Tranche 1 funding. In addition, Mr Wakefield asked what progress had been made with the feasibility study for the reopening of the railway to Haverhill.

Bob Menzies, Director of Strategy and Development at Cambridgeshire County Council, confirmed that the feasibility study referred to in the question had been included in the report as a background paper. He also explained that Members of the City Deal Executive Board and officers had met with the Chairman of Network Rail as well as there being significant engagement between officers and representatives of Network Rail regarding the large number of railway projects ongoing or proposed in Cambridgeshire. He reiterated that lots of different engagement was taking place between City Deal partners and the railway industry.

In discussing the contents of the report, the following points by Members of the Joint Assembly were noted:

- significant employment growth was expected in Sawston which would impact traffic levels and should be taken into account as part of the reassessment of traffic. A question was also raised as to whether the proposed route could include Sawston to support this growth;
- growth in other areas affected by the proposed scheme had also not been taken into account as part of the initial modelling, so the reassessment was welcomed;
- the diagrams included with the consultation document should make it clear as to network links and where they would actually go, as well as demonstrate that this was a linked up scheme;
- it was difficult to visualise who this scheme was targeted at in terms of people travelling between Cambridge and the M11, with the proposed Park and Ride solution or enhanced bus route also potentially causing some confusion. Mr Menzies explained that there may be more fluidity to the scheme as it developed and made the point that things continued to emerge in the area, which was one of the key challenges with this particular project. It was agreed that the vision for this scheme needed to be clear in order that people understood what it was seeking to accomplish;
- this scheme should not lose focus on cycling and walking provision, in terms of travelling to Haverhill, and consideration should perhaps be given to including a specific link for this purpose;
- depending on what options emerged as this scheme developed, it was unclear whether it could be delivered within Tranche 1 of the City Deal programme, or Tranche 2. 'Off-road options' would make it very challenging to include as a Tranche 1 scheme as a result of the statutory processes and respective timescales that would be necessary;
- it was important to establish how the City Deal could ensure that services put in place on transport infrastructure schemes, such as bus services for example, were effective for the solutions that were being made available as a result of the investment. Councillor Bick suggested inviting representatives of the bus operators to meet with Members of the Joint Assembly to discuss this issue. Officers were therefore asked to facilitate such a meeting, with an informal setting suggested as being the most appropriate, to also include Members of the Executive Board.

Councillor Bick sought some clarity as to the signing off process for the publication of consultation documentation for City Deal schemes. Mr Menzies explained that publication occurred once approval had been granted by the Executive Board and said that the previously undertaken consultation for the Western Orbital scheme had been shared informally with all Members of the Joint Assembly and Executive Board prior to its publication. Councillor Bick welcomed this approach.

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the findings summarised in the report and the Draft Concepts Report and **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board:

- (a) 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.
- (b) Approved for public consultation the illustrative concepts set out in the report to provide improved Park and Ride linked to Bus Rapid Transit between Fourwentways and Cambridge, and cycling and walking measures along the corridor.

- (c) 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.

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

The Joint Assembly 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.

Comments by Members of the Joint Assembly, in discussing the contents of the report, were noted as follows:

- the low likelihood of a commercial service operating at this junction was a significant issue;
- a bus-only solution seemed illogical for this junction. Mr Walmsley explained that it would be extremely unlikely for Highways England to give consent for any proposal in this respect that included cars as well as buses, on the basis that it would itself become a new junction;
- this specific project did not fit in with the bigger picture of transport infrastructure schemes included as part of the City Deal programme;
- this project would be an unnecessary diversion from the Western Orbital corridor scheme;
- despite the perceived lack of commercial opportunities, employers were still keen for this project to progress;
- there would be a significant increase in traffic movement in terms of staff, patients and visitors, as a result of Papworth Hospital moving to the Addenbrooke's site;
- if employers in the area agreed to fund a service instead of commercial operators, there was a danger that they could cease that service at any time thereby leaving the route unused and resulting in wasted resources;
- there would be significant pressure in this area in the years to come, but the solution proposed in this instance was not the right way to address it.

NOTE – Councillor Nick Wright declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item as a Governor of Papworth Hospital.

NOTE – Dr John Wells declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item as a Governor of Addenbrooke's Hospital.

The Joint Assembly unanimously **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.

Councillor Bick, Chairman, invited Members to vote on recommendation (ii) set out in the report, which recommended that the Executive Board be asked to proceed with the further development of the proposal to assess its final viability for inclusion in the Tranche 1 City Deal programme. He also invited Members to vote on paragraph 17 of the report, which recommended the integration of the scheme into the developing Western Orbital proposals to ensure that it was considered within this wider strategic context. With 7 votes in favour of recommendation (ii) and 8 votes in favour of paragraph 17, the Joint Assembly **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.

12. **SMART CAMBRIDGE - 'SMART TECHNOLOGY CITY MANAGEMENT PLATFORM' INVESTMENT**

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.

Noelle Godfrey, Connecting Cambridgeshire Programme Director, 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.

Members made reference to an extremely useful and informative presentation on the Smart Technology City Management Platform that had been held informally prior to the meeting.

Councillor Dave Baigent questioned whether the technology and software required as part of this project could be provided by other companies, such as Google for example, and asked whether such companies were already capable of providing similar services. Noelle Godfrey said that some of this work would use leading edge technology, with the principal difference being that this would be delivered at 'real-time' and provide an opportunity to combine greater data sets locally as part of the architecture.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Helen Valentine and Councillor Nick Wright all spoke in favour of the project and Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman, added his support saying that he was impressed by the capability of what was being proposed.

The Joint Assembly:

- (a) **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board approved the investment of £300,000 to develop a first stage 'smart technology city management platform' for Greater Cambridge.
- (b) **REQUESTED** a progress report in six months.

13. CITY DEAL WORKSTREAM UPDATE

The Joint Assembly received an update report on City Deal workstreams.

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, presented the update and reported the following:

- a Strategic Communications Manager had been appointed and was expected to commence their post on 29 February 2016;
- the Cambridge Promotion Agency had reviewed its goals in respect of the skills workstream. The Joint Assembly sub-group was scheduled to meet in March to review its progress;
- a number of key consultations were due to close shortly, so Assembly Members were asked to encourage as many responses to them as possible;
- the City Deal website included more detailed information on the Smart City project, including the presentation slides delivered at the informal workshop held before this meeting.

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the update.

14. GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL FORWARD PLAN

The Joint Assembly considered the City Deal Forward Plan.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman, noted the number and significance of the agenda items scheduled for consideration at the June meeting of the Assembly and Board in comparison to the agenda for the July meeting which did not consist of any substantial items at this stage. In asking whether some items in June should be deferred to the July meeting, Members unanimously agreed that the list of items scheduled to be considered at the Joint Assembly on 2 June 2016 should continue as planned, but that this should be an all-day meeting commencing at 10.00 a.m.

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the Forward Plan.

The Meeting ended at 5.35 p.m.
