



**GREATER
CAMBRIDGE
CITY DEAL**

Securing future prosperity

GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL JOINT ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly held on
Wednesday, 1 March 2017 at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly:

Councillor Roger Hickford	Cambridgeshire County Council (Chairman)
Councillor Kevin Price	Cambridge City Council (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Tim Bick	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 Tim Wotherspoon	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Claire Ruskin	Cambridge Network
Helen Valentine	Anglia Ruskin University
Dr John Wells	Cancer Research UK Cambridge Institute

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

Ian Bates	Cambridgeshire County Council
Lewis Herbert	Cambridge City Council (Executive Board Chairman)

Officers:

Graham Hughes	Executive Director Economy, Transport and Environment, Cambridgeshire County Council
Tanya Sheridan	Programme Director, Greater Cambridge City Deal
Jeremy Smith	Head of Transport & Infrastructure Policy and Funding, Cambridgeshire County Council
Rachel Stopard	Interim Chief Executive, Greater Cambridge City Deal
Chris Tunstall	Interim Transport Director, Greater Cambridge City Deal
Victoria Wallace	Democratic Services Officer, South Cambridgeshire District Council

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were noted from Sir Michael Marshall, Mark Robertson and Andy Williams.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Claire Ruskin declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to discussions regarding the Cambridge Promotion Agency.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 18 January 2017 were agreed as a correct record.

4. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

The Chairman informed the Joint Assembly that seven public questions had been received, four of which would be taken at the meeting under agenda items six and eight. A new process would be implemented whereby a log of public questions would be published after each meeting.

Councillor Bridget Smith requested that the notice of public questions be sent to Joint Assembly members earlier than the day before the meeting. The Chairman informed members that the deadline for public questions was not long before the meeting and that the public question process was being ironed out and would become quicker in future.

5. PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

6. CITY DEAL PROGRESS REPORT

Richard Wood was invited to ask his pre-submitted public question, as detailed in the notice of public questions.

The City Deal Programme Director presented the City Deal progress report and responded to Mr Wood's question, informing him and the Joint Assembly that the City Deal would not become a Local Transport Authority under devolution proposals. This would be a role for the forthcoming Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, which would inherit some but not all transport powers from the County Council.

Joint Assembly members discussed the report. The main points of discussion were:

- In response to a query from the Chairman, officers confirmed that the City Deal was potentially a £1 billion investment programme.
- The Joint Assembly was informed that the first phase of the City Deal's website redevelopment project would be delivered in April/May 2017. A note to inform Joint Assembly members of the website project would be circulated.
- In response to a query regarding what was meant by the City Deal investing in the Housing Development Agency, the City Deal Programme Director clarified that the City Deal was providing support financially to organisations delivering housing.
- Councillor Bick pointed out that the score of Risk 2 in the risk register, should be 5.
- The Joint Assembly was informed that a meeting would take place with Highways England on 10 March 2017, which the Chairman of the City Deal Executive Board would attend.

- It was clarified that the Smart Cambridge workstream was an enabling stream of work and was not about creating jobs.
- Councillor Bridget Smith requested that:
 - When talking about housing, the City Deal specify this is housing on rural exception sites and non local plan sites.
 - That the word 'key' be removed in reference to members as it was felt that all members were key and should be involved.
- Councillor Smith felt that little funding had been secured for match funding and that this should be regarded as a higher risk. The Chairman advised that this would be kept under review.
- Councillor Cuffley asked what direct input the City Deal had had in the growth of apprenticeships. In response to this, the Joint Assembly was informed that the City Deal's main input had been in funding the events and outreach work of Form the Future, which linked students, employers and training providers. The outputs and benefits of these activities would be evaluated. Members were informed that Councillor Bick and Claire Ruskin were part of a skills group which monitored and evaluated the outputs of this work.

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the City Deal progress report.

7. 2017/18 BUDGET SETTING

The City Deal Programme Director presented the Budget Setting 2017/18 report which Joint Assembly members discussed.

Councillor Cuffley commented that investment in the Smart Cambridge programme seemed low and asked if the budget could be reviewed. The City Deal Programme Director advised that the investment would do much to support the smarter aspects of the transport strategy and that for the time being, this was the investment that was needed. The Joint Assembly was informed that the £1.6 million investment had the potential to leverage further funding, including EU funding, and that further proposals coming forward would not be ruled out.

In response to a question from Councillor Smith, the Joint Assembly was informed that:

- The revenue to fund the strengthening of City Deal programme management, governance, strategy and coordination capacity and funding finance and democratic services support, would come from the new homes bonus.
- The operations and infrastructure budgets were kept separate.
- The Gateway Review referred to in the report would be an economic assessment by the Government on City Deal and development schemes.
- It was agreed in November 2016 that there should be allocations for finance and democratic services support for the City Deal.
- Officers clarified that some schemes could go into either the operations or infrastructure budgets.

In response to concern raised by Councillor Smith regarding the short term nature of interim support to the City Deal, the City Deal's Interim Chief Executive informed members that part of her remit was to look at the long term fit for purpose structure, and to plan for the future.

Councillor Smith requested an up to date list of all City Deal officers and their contact details be provided to Joint Assembly members.

Chris Tunstall was introduced to the Joint Assembly as the City Deal's Interim Transport

Director.

Councillor Smith pointed out that the risk of achievability of S106 receipts was only marked as amber on the risk register.

In response to Councillor Bick's question regarding government triggers, the Joint Assembly was informed that the triggers were:

1. Whether the City Deal was on track and on budget according to final business cases.
2. If anything had already been delivered, whether it had delivered the benefits that were outlined in the project's final business case.
3. Whether investment and infrastructure delivered had delivered economic growth. The Government acknowledged that this was hard to measure.

In response to a question from Councillor Kavanagh, the Joint Assembly was informed that the £100,000 investment would deliver four electric vehicle charging points and that the City Council had put in place a strategy for affordable and convenient electric vehicle charging points strategy. Joint Assembly members expressed surprise and concern at the cost of the four charging points, which would only be for use by taxis. In response to this concern members were informed that the initial £100,000 investment would trigger further funding, which would result in 19 fast and 21 rapid charging points. Members were informed that the City Deal and City Council would each provide £100,000 of funding and the Office for Low Emission Vehicles (OLEV) would provide £350,000. The Joint Assembly was reminded that the City Deal was contributing to a wider project and that further information on the electric vehicle charging point strategy and its delivery, would be circulated to members.

In response to concern raised that the electric vehicle charging points would only be for taxis, it was explained that the rationale for this was that the city's diesel taxi fleet contributed significantly to pollution in Cambridge.

The Chairman requested a paper on electric vehicle charging points be presented to the Joint Assembly in June 2017, to include costings and the vision for charging points for residents.

Councillor Bick expressed concern for the potential for councils to claim money from the City Deal to deliver services for which they were responsible. Whilst it was hoped this would not happen, Councillor Bick asked how the City Deal would gate keep this. In response to this the City Deal Programme Director highlighted the challenge sessions referred to in the report, which would challenge whether projects were additional to existing projects and whether they delivered the City Deal objectives.

Concern was raised by a number of members that not enough information was available in the report to allow the decisions being requested to be made:

- Councillor Smith expressed particular concern about this in relation to electric vehicle charging points and rural transport hubs, and advised that these be omitted until further information had been presented.
- Councillor Bick advised that the Joint Assembly should have reports presented to it regarding the strategic planning and transport framework, before spending was agreed.
- In response to concern raised by Councillor Bick regarding the lack of business cases, the City Deal Programme Director advised that the provision of proportionate business cases had been agreed, with more detail being provided as appropriate. The Interim Chief Executive informed members that where the Executive Board was being asked to commission feasibility studies, these would

- be presented on completion along with further proposals and business cases.
- In response to the concerns raised, the City Deal Programme Director drew the Joint Assembly's attention to the appendix to the report which set out the business cases and analysis of the proposals for additional spend. The Joint Assembly was informed that reports would be brought back to the Joint Assembly regarding bigger projects that required bigger spends.
- The City Deal Programme Director referred to the projects listed in the appendix to the report, providing clarification to Joint Assembly members on what the Executive Board was being asked to agree to regarding each project.
- In relation to the concerns raised by some Joint Assembly members regarding a lack of information and business cases, Helen Valentine pointed out that more detail regarding each project was provided later in the report and advised that the charging points project be proceeded with, but that a report be brought back to the Joint Assembly at a later date regarding larger scale roll out of charging points for private electric vehicles.

The Joint Assembly was informed that a bid had been submitted for a project to look at the joining up of networks and systems in order to make best use of pollution monitoring data. Councillor Baigent expressed a wish to see pollution level indicators displayed on the street in order to make the public aware of pollution levels.

Following the discussion and debate, the Chairman summarised the concerns raised by the Joint Assembly as regarding:

- Investment in electric vehicle charging points across Cambridge
- Feasibility work on South Cambridgeshire travel hubs
- The Greater Cambridge strategic planning and transport framework
- Scaling up the Smart Cambridge programme programme and attracting further investment in data and technologies.

Taking into account the concerns raised, the Joint Assembly **RECOMMENDED** that:

1. The Executive Board agrees to allocate additional or new resource to:
 - (i) Developing up to 12 cycling 'greenways' in South Cambridgeshire (£480K for development work over 2 years (2017 – 2019)).
 - (ii) City Access project – invest £5.045m to accelerate the delivery of the eight point plan. The need for significant resources was detailed in paragraph 13 of the January 2017 Board report. It enables the parallel and balanced progression of the eight delivery plans, including prioritisation of a parking strategy (£250K) and required staffing resources (£702K).
 - (iii) Co-investment in electric vehicle charging points across Cambridge (£100K one off cost in 17/18).
 - (iv) Travel audit to support case for Cambridge South Station and future transport requirements for the Biomedical Campus (£150K one off cost in 17/18).
 - (v) Initial feasibility work on South Cambridgeshire Travel Hubs, including on key routes (£100k one off cost in 17/18).
 - (vi) Strengthening programme management, governance, strategy and coordination capacity and funding finance and Democratic Services support (£339K over 3 years, mostly up front investment).
 - (vii) Strengthening public engagement and communications by investing in better systems, capacity and expertise (£338K over 3 years).
 - (viii) One year funding to Cambridge Promotions Agency to transition to fully-funded model (£40K).
 - (ix) Greater Cambridge strategic planning and transport framework – towards 2050

(£230K one off cost in 17/18).

- (x) City Centre spaces and movement framework (£150K one off cost in 17/18).
- (xi) Scaling up the Smart Cambridge programme and attracting further investment in data and technologies (£1.640m over 3 years). It will focus on three aspects:(a) Better quantity, quality and use of data to improve information available to citizens, (b) Embedding digital solutions and emerging technology in City Deal work streams to ensure long term sustainable success, and (c) A collaborative approach that uses the power of digital technologies to galvanise the business, community and academic sectors to work together and use their combined strengths to produce better outcomes for Greater Cambridge.

2. That the Executive Board considers later in the year the following two indicative requests and to develop detailed business cases to enable Board decisions:

- (i) Implementation of Residents' Parking Schemes within Cambridge City (indicative maximum of £1.0 m over 3 years).
- (ii) Scaling up original pilot skills work on stimulating business demand for apprenticeships and improving careers advice in schools into second phase of activity and investing in a wider reach (indicative maximum of £2.1m over 3 years).

3. That the Executive Board notes:

- The financial position, including that all partner authorities have agreed to contribute 40% of their respective New Homes Bonus (NHB) allocation from 2017/18 to 2019/20.
- That if the proposed allocations are approved, this would mean an over-allocation of existing available resources of £4.8m, which would have to be treated as a managed risk to be offset with either new Tranche 2 funding, other funding, or reductions in agreed schemes in future years. Given over half the Infrastructure Programme budget is forecast to be spent beyond 2020 this is considered an appropriate strategy to maximise outcomes within available resources.
- The "Programme management and early scheme development including Tranche 2 prioritisation" budget has been reduced from £10.45m to £4.95m.
- That further to the Financial Strategy agreed last November, all infrastructure Schemes profiles have been updated to reflect the latest estimated forecast of expenditure across the years, with total forecast spend unchanged (except in "Programme management and early scheme development", see above, which has reduced).
- The existing £3m "City centre capacity improvements" budget has been moved into the Operations Budget along with the proposed new funding so it is all in one place.
- That all existing commitments will be reviewed on an annual basis to inform financial profiling and prioritisation of resources.
- That funding is treated flexibly between the Infrastructure Budget and the Operations Budget, where necessary, to maximise the use of resources.
- In 2018, a two year budget will be developed in order to align with external factors e.g. Gateway Review

8. **A1307 THREE CAMPUSES TO CAMBRIDGE BUS, CYCLE AND WALKING IMPROVEMENTS - CONSULTATION RESULTS AND SELECTION OF PREFERRED OPTION**

Antony Carpen, Robin Heydon and Jim Chisholm asked their pre-submitted questions, as detailed in the notice of public questions.

Graham Hughes, Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the A1307 three campuses to Cambridge report. The public questions were answered during the presentation of this report.

In response to his question, Mr Carpen was informed that a Cambridge-Haverhill railway line had been discounted for the following reasons:

- Rail was a very expensive form of infrastructure to deliver. This scheme would cost £390 million, with a very low benefit to cost ratio (BCR). The scale of the scheme and likely benefit returned could not justify City Deal investment.
- Capacity constraints of sharing light rail with heavy rail existed south of Cambridge station.
- Parts of the track had been removed between Cambridge and Haverhill, making reinstatement difficult and expensive.

An overview of the public consultation responses was provided. It was explained that modelling in developing the proposed options, had included all planned growth and development to 2031.

In response to Mr Heydon's question, the following points were made:

- The need to provide high quality cycling standards was agreed with.
- Design standards used were TA9105 and TA9005 along with Sustrans and Camcycle guidance.
- The great benefit from working closely with Camcycle and other organisations was recognised, in order to develop and make changes over and above the design guidance.
- Highways England was being worked closely with regarding the proposals to cross the A11. The City Deal would also like to work with Camcycle in order to develop the concepts into more detailed schemes.
- Mr Heydon expressed further concern regarding the 10 metre width of land to contain both bus and cycle facilities, advising that the strip of land should be 15 metres wide. In response to this, Mr Hughes advised that there was always a balance between funding and land available and the schemes that could be provided. This scheme was at the concept stage and therefore further debate would be welcomed in order to work out the balance with this scheme.

In response to Mr Chisholm's question, the following points were made:

- Decisions on projects were not only based on benefit to cost ratio (BCR).
- Focus had been on the A1307 corridor, with the creation of infrastructure for this route thought to be logical and sensible.
- Greenways if developed would be very attractive, however it was recognised that many cyclists wanted to get directly from their start point to destination and often this meant cycling on a road, so the routes proposed here were also considered necessary.
- It was important not to see this package of measures in isolation, but to consider how it integrated with other schemes.

Councillor Tony Orgee, Chairman of the A1307 Local Liaison Forum (LLF), was invited to

speak. Councillor Orgee updated the Joint Assembly on the LLF discussions regarding the A1307, making the following points:

- Councillor Orgee informed the Joint Assembly that the A1307 report had only been made available three hours before the LLF meeting at which the proposals were discussed. The LLF did not feel that this was acceptable.
- Improvements to signalised junctions and westbound bus lanes in Linton had been discussed at length by the LLF. Councillor Orgee highlighted that nothing had been included in the proposals regarding improving bus journeys eastwards as well as westwards.
- It was felt that there had been a lack of consultation with Linton Parish Council, as well as other neighbouring areas and councils.
- The broad principal of new and improved cycleways was very much accepted by the LLF.
- The cycleway bridge over the A11 was not user friendly. It was felt that ramped access was needed and safety railings were not high enough.
- It was felt that improvements to the cycleway on Babraham Road were urgently needed.
- Problems were raised with all of the suggested park and ride sites. The LLF supported a park and ride to the east of Linton.
- Concerns were raised regarding the details of the proposals of a new westbound bus lane between the new park and ride site and Hinton Way roundabout.
- The LLF had found it difficult to engage on the proposal of a new segregated bus route from Babraham Road park and ride to the Biomedical Campus, as it was unsure if this was on or off road. Questions were raised regarding whether some of the proposals were feasible and whether all landowners had been consulted in case more land needed to be purchased to deliver projects. Concern was also raised as to whether other councils had been consulted on proposals.
- A vote was taken at the LLF meeting, the result of which agreed that a pause should be taken for further work to be undertaken before a decision on the A1307 corridor was made by the City Deal Executive Board. Approximately 30-35 people had attended the LLF meeting.
- In response to Councillor Orgee, Mr Hughes apologised for the lateness of the A1307 report.

The Joint Assembly discussed and debated the proposals. Councillor Cuffley raised concerns, making the following points:

- It was felt that there was a lack of a holistic overview, with neighbouring areas such as Bury St Edmunds, Newmarket and Royston having not been consulted. Furthermore Sawston, Babraham and the Genome Campus had neither been considered nor consulted.
- It was pointed out that a bus lane needed to be eastbound and westbound, so that people could be taken to work and back.
- The project should be paused as so much critical detail was lacking.

In response to Councillor Cuffley's concerns, Mr Hughes emphasised that proposals were not detailed at this stage and were broad recommendations on concepts. Consultation would take place on these and further work and modelling would then be undertaken.

Councillor Smith commended officers for the quality of the report and was pleased that value for money had been a key consideration. However, Councillor Smith raised concerns and agreed with Councillor Orgee and the Local Liaison Forum, that proposals were premature. Councillor Smith advised that time should be given to allow new technologies to come forward and for other initiatives to bed in first so that different projects did not clash and negate each others benefits. She also advised that city access

work should be undertaken first. Councillor Smith therefore called for a pause to the A1307 project.

Claire Ruskin commented that these were sensible proposals with great potential that should be progressed rapidly. Ms Ruskin expressed support for the proposals to move forward and for further work and consultation to take place as part of this rather than pausing. In response to the concerns raised by Councillor Smith, Ms Ruskin commented that these proposals would complement any emerging new technologies.

Councillor Baigent expressed support for the wider cycleway. He asked what would happen to the other road traffic if a segregated bus lane was built, raising concern that traffic would be able to move faster and get in front of buses, thereby blocking the buses on their exit from the busway. Councillor Baigent suggested restrictive measures on cars to prevent this happening should be considered.

Councillor Bick advised that the roads were at risk of backfilling with more traffic unless proper demand management systems were put in place.

In response to a question from Councillor Bick, the Joint Assembly was informed that the park and ride would not necessarily reduce the number of buses from Sawston to the city and may offer the opportunity to increase the number of buses and services. The example of St Ives was given, where the guided busway had led to an increase in bus services from St Ives and had not reduced the services from the surrounding villages, while also leading to a 2% reduction in traffic on the A14. Councillor Bick raised concern that an impact of the park and ride site could be an increase in traffic caused by people driving from Sawston to the park and ride.

Dr Wells advised that the A1307 was an important and major route serving the biomedical campus. He encouraged the project's momentum be maintained while addressing the concerns raised, pointing out that the route was congested and dangerous and was key for the biomedical campus.

Concern was raised regarding lack of integration, with the importance of join up of the whole route from Haverhill to the biomedical campus and on to the city centre. It was felt that the Addenbrooke's roundabout could cause a problem at a later date.

The following was advised:

- Detail of elements such as turning points for buses in the biomedical campus needed to be considered, in order to provide an effective service.
- Worts' Causeway could be looked at as an additional bus route as this was already used by bus drivers.
- That the collecting mechanisms to get more people on buses be considered, such for example a park and ride further out in order to enhance flow.
- The solution to ease congestion between the park and ride site and the Addenbrooke's roundabout should maintain a pedestrian route. Concern was raised that this may be squeezed out by a busway due to the narrowness of the road.
- Access of emergency vehicles needed to be considered so that their movement was not restricted.
- Dr Wells advised that papers needed to set out in a quantitative way what the road was being designed to deliver, setting out a clear design requirement. It was pointed out that while 16,000 people worked on the biomedical campus, the bus route only delivered 1600 people there.

Councillor Price expressed his understanding of the views of the Local Liaison Forum, however agreed that the A1307 should not be paused.

Councillor Kavanagh expressed support for the project to continue to proceed, pointing out that nearly 1500 people responded to the public consultation, most of which supported the proposals. He also felt that this route was too important for the project to be paused given it was dangerous and that more casualties along the route were likely to occur if the project was paused. He felt that the proposal of a second park and ride site along the route was very positive.

Councillor Wotherspoon, expressed the view as a cyclist that the A1307 corridor was a treacherous route for cycling and that something needed to be done about it. Councillor Wotherspoon expressed support for maintaining the project's momentum whilst acknowledging the concerns raised by the LLF. He also made a plea for the future proofing of plans.

Helen Valentine expressed support for maintaining momentum, pointing out that there would be no pause in growth of the biomedical campus and other research parks.

Councillor Smith called upon the City Deal to bear in mind and address customer satisfaction as does Highways England on its major schemes. She advised a short pause to run high quality customer workshops, pointing out that in other areas she thought that the City Deal may risk judicial review due to a lack of public engagement and consultation. She advised the opportunity be taken at an early stage for the City Deal to take its customers with it.

Claire Ruskin commented that workshops were part of the next phase and that there was no need to pause the project in order to allow for workshops to be undertaken, but that these should be done alongside the continuation of work.

Councillor Cuffley expressed support for customer workshops to be undertaken.

Councillor Orgee informed the Joint Assembly that the Local Liaison Forum consisted of county, district and parish councillors. He clarified that in advance of the meeting, officers had been asked to keep their presentation brief, however this was advised on the assumption that the A1307 report would be received on time, which it was not and as such LLF members had not had the background knowledge for what was being presented to them. Councillor Orgee advised that the traffic congestion from Haverhill to the city centre needed to be addressed as buses got held up in this.

Due to the concerns raised, the Chairman proposed that the second public consultation exercise should be delayed until September 2017, to allow for workshops to take place with the LLF and councillors, which would inform the consultation. A vote was taken on this proposal with eight Joint Assembly members voting in favour and three against.

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

- a) Notes the draft Consultation Report for publication on the GCCD website.
- b) Reviews the preferred options and approves further technical work to develop and refine the options, which improve public transport reliability, connectivity and access through park & ride expansion, proposals to deliver bus priority and increased cycling through improved infrastructure to support sustainable travel between homes and jobs, particularly:

- i) Road safety enhancements between Linton and Horseheath.
 - ii) Improvements to signalised junctions and westbound bus lanes in Linton.
 - iii) Measures to improve bus journey times through Linton High Street.
 - iv) New and improved cycleways between Babraham and Great Abington / Granta Park.
 - v) A new park and ride site near the A11.
 - vi) A new westbound bus lane between the new park and ride site and Hinton Way roundabout.
 - vii) A new segregated bus route from the Babraham Road park and ride site to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC). Further work alongside future City Deal prioritisation work will determine if this route is to be on road or a new off road route;
- (c) *Endorses a second public consultation exercise on the preferred options to commence in September 2017 after further workshops have taken place with Local Liaison Forums and councillors, and agrees a delegation to finalise consultation materials.*
- (d) Approves a one-off spend of £25,000 to undertake some transport modelling, as part of pre-Strategic Outline Business Case work on the dualling of the A1307 between Haverhill and the A11.

9. INDUSTRIAL STRATEGY

The City Deal's Interim Chief Executive presented the report seeking input to help shape the key themes that Greater Cambridge partners wished to emphasise in response to the Government's Industrial Strategy.

Claire Ruskin advised that submissions from all organisations around Cambridge known to want to make a response to this strategy, be coordinated and aligned with and that submissions cross referenced other organisations.

Councillor Bick advised that as clustering had been a factor giving rise to Cambridge's industrial success, this needed to be an important theme of the response. Councillor Bick also emphasised the importance of place base to the strategy.

The Joint Assembly was informed that the Head of Corporate Strategy, Cambridge City Council, would lead on this.

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

- a) Identifies any key themes or issues that should be emphasised in the Greater Cambridge response to the Government's Green Paper "Building our Industrial Strategy"
- b) Delegates authority to the City Deal Interim Chief Executive, in consultation with the Executive Board, to work with partners and stakeholders to develop a response to be submitted to Government by 17 April 2017.

10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The date of the next meeting, to be held on Wednesday 7 June at 2pm, was noted.

The Meeting ended at 5.40 p.m.
