



GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL EXECUTIVE BOARD

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board held on
Tuesday, 3 November 2015 at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board:

Councillor Lewis Herbert	Cambridge City Council (Chairman)
Councillor Ray Manning	South Cambridgeshire District Council (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Steve Count	Cambridgeshire County Council
Mark Reeve	Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership
Professor Jeremy Sanders	University of Cambridge

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

Councillor Dave Baigent	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Tim Bick	Cambridge City Council and Chairman of the Joint Assembly
Councillor Roger Hickford	Cambridgeshire County Council and Vice-Chairman of the Joint Assembly
Councillor Noel Kavanagh	Cambridgeshire County Council

Officers/advisors:

Alan Carter	Cambridge City Council
Antoinette Jackson	Cambridge City Council
Andrew Limb	Cambridge City Council
Graham Hughes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Brian Stinton	Cambridgeshire County Council
Noelle Godfrey	Connecting Cambridgeshire Partnership
Aaron Blowers	Greater Cambridgeshire City Deal Partnership
Tanya Sheridan	Greater Cambridgeshire City Deal Partnership
Alex Colyer	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Graham Watts	South Cambridgeshire District Council

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

John Bridge, representing the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership, submitted his apologies for absence. Mark Reeve, Chairman of the Enterprise Partnership, was in attendance as Mr Bridge's substitute.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 1 October 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Questions asked or statements made, together with any responses from Members of the Executive Board or officers, were noted as follows:

Question by Lynn Heiatt

Lynn Heiatt presented the Executive Board with a petition, which had received 3,568 signatures to date, objecting to one of the City Deal proposals to build a two-way bus road across the Coton corridor and through the West Fields of Cambridge. She said that this was being submitted as evidence of public opinion on option 1(c), now referred to as 'option 1 South', as part of the 'Better Busways' consultation process.

Mrs Heiatt pointed out that the petition demonstrated, despite early assumptions and public statements to the contrary, that the majority of petitioners did not live in one particular area of the City as responses had been received from all over the United Kingdom and from 33 countries abroad. She referred to the Board's 'call for evidence' and the sentiment that the public were being urged to come forward with their views. She therefore asked whether this petition and the signatures and comments contained within it against Option 1 South would be counted in the consultation process.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman, thanked Mrs Heiatt for the petition and welcomed the fact that so many people had shared their views. He gave an assurance that the petition and any comments included as part of it would be taken into full account as part of the consultation exercise.

Councillor Herbert emphasised that the Board had not made any decisions on a scheme at this stage. A report analysing the responses to this initial consultation process would be considered by the Board and he made the point that variations to the options published as part of the consultation documentation, or any other additional options, would be welcomed. These would be subject to deliverability and assessment and would also be considered by the Executive Board Joint Assembly.

Question by Dr Gabriel Fox

Dr Gabriel Fox referred to the consultation document circulated for 'Better Bus Journeys' and claimed that it was materially inaccurate in four respects. He believed that these inaccuracies would have such a significant impact on the response of consultees as to render the entire consultation exercise worthless. These were noted as follows:

- the potential impact on Coton was misrepresented;
- journey times were inaccurate and misleading;
- the potential for cycleway improvements had been mis-stated;
- specific environmental impacts had been ignored.

Dr Fox believed that if consultees were properly informed on the above issues, they would form a different view on the relative strength of options and therefore felt that responses obtained from the current consultation would be unreliable and would not be able to be used to guide decision-making. He asked whether the Board would agree to distribute additional material to consultees to correct these inaccuracies and allow additional time for

responses to be submitted. Dr Fox also asked if the Board would agree to be more collaborative with other stakeholders, such as Coton Parish Council, in the development of such additional material and in further consultations on transport issues to the West of Cambridge.

Graham Hughes, Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, said that it had been made clear that this was a conceptual consultation which included broad principles and that any lines on plans included as part of the documentation were not precise. He reminded the Board that there were likely to be two further consultation exercises in relation to this scheme as part of its development, with each stage becoming more detailed.

Mr Hughes confirmed that recommendations on this conceptual consultation would be submitted to the Board following analysis of the responses received. The consultation, in view of its solely conceptual status at this stage, was written in a way which balanced the need for detail against the need for simplicity in order to achieve the maximum number of responses possible. Mr Hughes accepted that this balance was difficult to achieve, but emphasised that much more detail would follow in the later consultation stages. He added that people may wish to submit much more detailed submissions in response to this conceptual consultation, which was something he would welcome.

Councillor Lewis Herbert did not think it was necessary to issue additional material at this stage in view of the conceptual nature of the consultation and the further consultation processes planned for this scheme that would themselves contain much more detail.

Question by Antony Carpen

Antony Carpen made reference to a statement Heidi Allen MP had issued on Twitter regarding her concerns about the pace and direction of the City Deal. He put forward his own concerns that the City Deal Joint Assembly was not functioning as well as it could do and may not be value for money for the people that attended the meetings. He suggested that presentations by officers be uploaded onto YouTube in order that they could be viewed before meetings themselves.

Mr Carpen felt that publicity and engagement for the City Deal had so far been weak, with no substantial open or safe spaces facilitated by the City Deal structures being put in place for people to work collaboratively to develop and improve ideas for the City or Region's future. He encouraged systematic engagement with large educational organisations and employers in and around the City, as well as taking advantage of state-funded programmes such as the National Citizen Service launched by the Cabinet Office. Mr Carpen had also heard nothing from the City Deal in terms of how best to use social and digital media and asked what was going to change, and when.

Councillor Herbert explained that City Deal partners continued to have a close working relationship with all local Members of Parliament. He was of the opinion that the public dialogue and the call for evidence scheduled to take place in November in respect of congestion in Cambridge met a lot of the concerns that Heidi Allen MP referred to on Twitter. This call for evidence on transport and congestion was further evidence of a consultative and listening approach by City Deal partners.

In terms of engagement in the wider context, Councillor Herbert said that Board Members would be pleased to attend community meetings or events whenever invited to do so in order to promote and discuss the City Deal programme.

Councillor Herbert confirmed that the Executive Board and Joint Assembly structure had been established in agreement with Government. He added that the City Deal itself now had its Programme Director in post to support and implement delivery of the programme, with a communications lead scheduled to be appointed shortly.

Question by Edward Leigh

Edward Leigh listed seven consultations of major strategic significance for transportation in the region, together with a further four that were shortly scheduled to be launched. He asked whether the Executive Board had considered the capacity of the general public, residents associations, businesses, special interest groups and Councillors to make considered and meaningful contributions to these consultations, together with the capacity of officers to present, collate responses and report on so many consultations.

Mr Leigh was of the opinion that the Board was already convinced that dedicated bus lanes were necessary because a smarter, more forward-looking and evidence-based solution was politically too challenging to contemplate. He named cities throughout Europe that had been pioneering and innovative and asked why bus lanes were the top priority when there were so many other strategically critical projects that more obviously needed investment and did not depend on how congestion in the City was tackled. These included:

- train stations at the Biomedical Campus, Harston, Soham and Fulbourn;
- new Park and Ride sites around the City;
- transport hubs serving rural centres;
- bridges over the railway at Foxton and Yarrow Road in Cherry Hinton;
- an all-ways junction at the Girton interchange;
- a three-way junction at the A11-A14;
- a southern relief road.

Further to his suggestion to the Joint Assembly, Mr Leigh asked whether anyone had approached the relevant Government Minister to sound out his request to pause the transport workstream of the City Deal.

Councillor Herbert highlighted that of the consultations Mr Leigh referred to, only four were City Deal consultations. He said that innovative or 'smart' solutions would not be ruled out and were very much welcomed. He reminded Mr Leigh that one of the key principles of the City Deal transport workstream was to address modal shift within the Greater Cambridge area.

Reflecting on the list of suggested projects put forward by Mr Leigh, Councillor Herbert said that Park and Ride facilities were part of the City Deal agenda and would be considered as part of specific schemes as they were developed. Network Rail had initially offered to pay for the Foxton railway crossing, hence it not being included in the list of City Deal priority schemes for tranche one and Councillor Herbert emphasised that the City Deal Executive Board did not have the funding or responsibility to address roads such as the A14 or southern relief road.

Councillor Herbert reported that dialogue had been ongoing between City Deal partners, senior Civil Servants and Ministers over the last year and at no stage had there been any indication that they were expecting and wanting anything different from the City Deal programme to what was being proposed. The key priority was to ensure that objectives in tranche one set by Government were delivered by 2019 to secure the next tranche of City Deal funding.

Question by Stephen Coates

Stephen Coates reported that the Save the West Fields campaign had serious concerns that consultation statements were based on a number of material inaccuracies, resulting in an imbalanced presentation that appeared to many readers as favouring one option over another. He was of the opinion that this could lead to a flawed appreciation of the options presented and was even likely to be seen as misleading. Mr Coates referred to a number of examples where such deficiencies, in his opinion, could render the consultation process defective and open to legal challenge. These were noted as follows:

- a claim that area 1 South only took 7 minutes when area 1 Central took 14 minutes was potentially misleading. The Atkins report set out very basic data which suggested that these two areas had not been presented on a like for like basis;
- a claim that area 1 South could lead to major improvements for cyclists was incorrect;
- the 'high quality' bus route only label given to area 1 South and the green designation of the route presented an obvious bias to anyone filling in the questionnaire.

Mr Coates asked whether the public could expect these problems to be addressed immediately given that the Atkins data indicated the consultation as presented was misleading.

In response to the suggestion that the consultation sought to lead people to respond in a certain way, Mr Hughes made it absolutely clear that this was not the case. As a conceptual consultation, there were very outline details attached to each option in the consultation documentation and everyone was welcome to submit their views which would be very carefully considered and analysed. He reiterated the point that the consultation at this stage looked to achieve a balance between simplicity and providing enough detail so that people could understand what each option consisted of in order that they would engage and submit their views.

In terms of the Atkins data, Mr Hughes explained that the timings illustrated the relative differences between the different types of solution available and were very broad indications of estimated journey times. More detailed information would be factored into subsequent consultation processes relating to this scheme as part of more in-depth work that would take place when developing a preferred route. He reminded Mr Coates that the preferred route would be shaped by responses received as part of this conceptual consultation stage.

Question by Sarah Street

Sarah Street asked why no ecological and visual impact statements had been provided in the leaflets for the A428 bus proposals and stated that several highly respected ecologists and historians had objected to the option 1 area South route, claiming that their concerns were not being addressed. As Cambridge was an important historic City, she felt that understanding the impact of the routes on the setting of Cambridge was critical. Mrs Street therefore asked how the consultation could be credible without taking these two vitally important aspects into consideration.

Mrs Street also highlighted that the draft proposed route of Option area 1 South went directly against the ruling of the High Court in 2008, which stated that the Coton corridor was critical for the setting of Cambridge and asked why this had not been taken into account.

Mrs Street also reported that a number of people, particularly in the Newnham area, had not received a copy of the consultation leaflet.

Councillor Herbert reiterated that the three options contained within the consultation were conceptual at this stage, with further detail on preferred routes scheduled to be included in subsequent consultations which would include findings of ecological and visual impact studies. Mr Hughes added that until a detailed scheme had been worked up these studies could not be undertaken but gave an assurance that, at the relevant stage of the process, ecology and other such studies would be very seriously considered as part of developing the scheme.

Referring to the High Court judgement, Mr Hughes confirmed that he was aware of the judgement but the option set out in the consultation documentation in relation to this was something that had to be considered at a later stage as more details were developed.

Mr Hughes thanked Mrs Street for reporting the issue of leaflet distribution and agreed to ask his team to liaise with her outside of the meeting to confirm those areas where copies had not been delivered and arrange for copies to be distributed.

Question by Richard Taylor

Richard Taylor, in respect of the proposed consultation on changes to Milton Road, put forward the following suggestions to the Board:

- give Cambridge's area committees the opportunity to take a role in the consultation, offering them the same standing as Milton Parish Council;
- place notices advertising the consultation on trees which may be felled as a result of the work;
- publish relevant traffic modelling data and conclusions;
- run the consultation in a manner which enables deliberation, publishing responses as they were submitted, allowing replies to others' submissions;
- point to the City Deal Joint Assembly's planned work on landscaping options from the consultation materials.

Mr Hughes responded to these points as follows:

- officers would be very pleased to attend area committee meetings as a means of engagement, highlighting, however, that they were different bodies from a governance perspective to Parish Councils;
- it would not be possible to place notices on individual trees due to the fact that there was not a specific scheme in place whereby individual trees had been identified as requiring felling. At this stage the consultation consisted of a range of options for consideration and the scheme was likely to go through two more periods of public consultation, which were highly likely to result in modifications to proposals going forward. It would only be when details of the scheme had been approved that information such as which trees requiring felling would be known. Any proposals would be contained on scheme plans at that time and publicised widely;
- the publishing of traffic modelling data and conclusions generally already took place as part of developing schemes;
- the process to be followed for the consultation followed best practice for transport scheme consultations and was the normal way that these would be carried out, in terms of everyone having an equal opportunity to put forward their views. It was therefore not proposed to run the consultation in the manner suggested by Mr

- Taylor;
• officers welcomed the Joint Assembly's planned work on landscaping options.

Question by Stacey Weiser

Stacey Weiser said that Cambridge Past, Present and Future agreed with the 'consultation overload' impression that Edward Leigh had raised. She said that City Deal consultations were running at such a pace that it came across as desperation and uncertainty over how to resolve the traffic congestion issues and added that consultation surveys, in her opinion, were poorly conceived, misleading and a long way from providing the opportunity for alternatives to be suggested.

Mrs Weiser questioned the timing of the call for evidence in relation to congestion and said that this should have been carried out much earlier in order to inform a wider transport and congestion policy strategy. Specific matters arising from such an exercise would highlight priorities and individual pinch points that could then be focussed on.

Mrs Weiser closed by saying that the process to date, in her view, had been piecemeal, rushed and disjointed.

Councillor Herbert reminded Mrs Weiser of the process that had been followed to assess and identify prioritised schemes for the City Deal programme as part of the first tranche of funding. He emphasised that there was significant pressure to deliver the Government's objectives by 2019 in order to secure the next tranche of City Deal funding and transport schemes, in particular, also had to meet strict business case criteria set by the Department for Transport in order to be implemented. Councillor Herbert said that the call for evidence was also a timely opportunity for contributions given the links to other consultations.

Question by Robin Heydon

Robin Heydon asked how the Cambridge Cycling Campaign could be involved earlier in the process such that the proposed junction designs could provide safer conditions for cycling whilst also doubling the motor traffic capacity and significantly reducing bus delays over those that were proposed to be consulted upon.

Mr Hughes responded by saying that the County Council had always had a good relationship with the Cycling Campaign, acknowledging that they did not always agree but explaining that the Council had to consider the balance of all users' views. Engagement had taken place with the Cycling Campaign on the Histon Road and Milton Road options and Mr Hughes agreed to arrange further discussions with the Campaign should they be necessary, although he reiterated that the process needed to be fair with regard to other user groups. He suggested that these discussions should focus on how best to use the Cycling Campaign's resources to move schemes forward effectively.

5. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE JOINT ASSEMBLY

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the City Deal Joint Assembly, presented his report on the key issues and recommendations following the meeting of the Joint Assembly held on 7 October 2015.

He reported that the Assembly endorsed the proposal from the Executive Board to co-own the investigation or call for evidence in relation to leading models of traffic management to address congestion in the City of Cambridge, which the Assembly had resolved to conduct at its previous meeting.

It was agreed that Councillor Bick would introduce recommendations relating to items on the agenda for this meeting at the relevant part of the meeting.

The Executive Board **NOTED** the report.

6. HISTON ROAD BUS PRIORITY, WALKING AND CYCLING MEASURES: APPROVAL TO CONSULT

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, agreed to facilitate the consideration of this item and the following item at minute number 7 in respect of Milton Road as one debate.

Two reports were considered which set out a range of measures that had emerged from an initial technical study of Histon Road and Milton Road. The reports explained the background to the development work in each case and sought approval to carry out a public consultation on these measures to inform the development of preferred proposals.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reported that the Assembly had considered both reports at its meeting on 7 October 2015 in relation to Histon Road and Milton Road and made the following points further to discussion by Assembly Members:

- an amendment to recommendation (b) of both reports was agreed to capture the commitment that ideas other than those offered in the consultation would be properly considered. This sought to add the words 'and encourages all other ideas to be properly considered' at the end of recommendation (b) in respect of both schemes;
- in terms of the impact of anticipated loss of trees and vegetation, the Joint Assembly resolved to invite an expert or consultant on landscaping in urban transport infrastructure schemes to a future meeting in order to orientate and inform Members of what could be possible in situations such as the potential changes to Histon Road and Milton Road by way of greening;
- officers had agreed that further clarity needed to be provided in the consultation documentation, including the meaning of dotted lines on maps relating to potential bus routes, definitions of 'advisory', 'mandatory' and 'segregated' cycleways, and that the focus of the projects was for cycling as well as bus use.

Councillor Bick confirmed that, subject to the above comments, the Joint Assembly had agreed that the options defined were appropriate to release for public consultation and supported the recommendations contained within both reports, taking into account the suggested amendment to recommendation (b) in both cases.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, supported the amendment to recommendation (b) and, as he had pointed out in answer to public questions earlier at this meeting, reiterated that alternatives to the options published as part of the consultation would be welcomed. He therefore proposed adding the words 'and encourages other ideas and options suggested to be considered' to recommendation (b) on both reports, which was agreed by the Board.

Councillor Herbert also supported the proposal from the Joint Assembly to seek more information on landscaping in urban transport infrastructure schemes and agreed that further clarity should be added to the consultation around the points identified by the Assembly.

In discussing costings, it was noted that at this stage of project development it was difficult to give a precise idea of the cost of delivering each set of proposals. Very high-level

costings had occurred to date and at this stage there was no certainty over how much each option could cost. A full assessment would be carried out, which would factor in a range of significant aspects including land purchases, compensation claims and the relocation of public utility apparatus.

The Executive Board:

- (a) **NOTED** the findings from the initial assessment and technical study.
- (b) **APPROVED** public consultation on the illustrative measures as set out in the report and as shown on the accompanying plans, and encourages other ideas and options suggested to be considered.
- (c) **AGREED** to receive a report on consultation in the Spring of 2016 on a preferred set of measures.

7. **MILTON ROAD BUS PRIORITY, WALKING AND CYCLING MEASURES: APPROVAL TO CONSULT**

This item was considered and debated as part of the previous item at minute number 6.

The Executive Board:

- (a) **NOTED** the findings from the initial assessment and technical study.
- (b) **APPROVED** public consultation on the illustrative measures as set out in the report and as shown on the accompanying plans, including consideration of further walking and cycling improvements at Mitcham's Corner, and encourages other ideas and options suggested to be considered.
- (c) **SUPPORTED** the consideration of changes to the Science Park-Cowley Road junction following the completion of a wider A10 corridor transport study.
- (d) **AGREED** to receive a report on consultation in mid-2016 on a preferred set of measures.

8. **SMARTER CAMBRIDGESHIRE UPDATE AND INVESTMENT PROPOSAL**

Consideration was given to a report which provided the Executive Board with an update on the progress of the Smarter Cambridgeshire workstream and outlined a proposal for the implementation of a 'smart' technology platform to facilitate the Smart Cities approach within the City Deal programme.

Noelle Godfrey, Connecting Cambridgeshire Programme Director, presented the report and highlighted the following updates from the workstream:

- the Smarter Cambridgeshire Project Board, comprising officers representing the five participating organisations, had been established and was now overseeing the multiple strands of the Smarter Cambridgeshire work stream;
- the wider Smarter Cambridgeshire Advisory Group, with representation from both Universities and local technology companies, had met and further workshops were planned;
- a successful 'hack' event, to encourage wider community engagement in the Smart Cities agenda, was held over the weekend of 31 October and 1 November. The

event included talks and demonstrations as well as teams coming together to work on solutions to City challenges using digital technology. There were more than 50 participants overall, with 8 potential solutions pitched to judges at the end of the event;

- work was progressing in support of a number of demonstrator test bed work packages, including:
 - a planning workshop for identifying the key components for a 'Smart A14';
 - outline agreement for station gateway way finding improvements;
 - enabling work packages to support the development of a dynamic journey planner;
- a collaborative joint bid had been submitted for the 'Innovate UK Internet of Things' competition, which involved joint working with Milton Keynes and Leeds City Councils with support BT and the involvement of several other commercial organisations, and had reached the second round in the process.

In terms of the Smart City technology platform, it was reported that an outline proposal had now been developed for the implementation of a platform to support the delivery of the Smarter Cambridgeshire workstream within the City Deal programme. This comprised a city management network, a data hub and sensor deployment plan and was the result of work undertaken to create a smart architecture blueprint. Further details relating to the platform were set out in the report. The £280,000 of further investment being sought was to set up the foundations in order to allow the platform and related aspects of the workstream to develop further.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, provided the Board with an update following consideration of this report by the Assembly on 7 October 2015. The Assembly had welcomed the report but Members requested that future reports specified what the requested funding would actually be spent on, noting that in this case it was for the procurement of necessary hardware and software.

Noelle Godfrey acknowledged the comments and reported that a detailed proposal would be submitted to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board for consideration in February and March 2016, respectively.

Councillor Herbert thanked Noelle Godfrey and her team for the work that had gone into preparing the joint bid, which had now reached the last six submissions, together with the work that went into holding the successful 'hack' event.

The Executive Board:

- (a) **NOTED** the progress of the Smarter Cambridgeshire workstream to date.
- (b) **AGREED**, in principle, to support the investment of up to £280,000 to implement a Smart Technology Platform subject to a more detailed investment proposal in early 2016.

9. 2015/16 QUARTER 2 FINANCIAL MONITORING REPORT

A report was considered which set out the City Deal's financial monitoring position for the period ending 30 September 2015.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, reminded Board Members that a comprehensive budget report for 2016/17 would be submitted for consideration in the New Year.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, provided the Board with an update following consideration of this report by the Assembly on 7 October 2015. The Assembly had requested that future reports included the additional locally-sourced capital funding, such as developer contributions, that had been committed in principle to supplement the Government's City Deal grant. A commitment had been made by officers to include this information in the 2016/17 budget report.

The Executive Board **NOTED** the financial position, as at 30 September 2015.

10. **SIX-MONTHLY REPORT ON HOUSING**

The Executive Board considered a report which provided an update on progress with the Housing workstream.

Alan Carter, Head of Strategic Housing at Cambridge City Council, presented the report which outlined governance around the Housing Development Agency that had been established, together with information on schemes and anticipated numbers of new housing. A supplementary report was also considered, setting out the latest developments with regard to affordable housing in light of radically changing national housing, planning and welfare policy.

It was reported that the requirement for registered providers and stock retaining local authorities to reduce rents by 1% per annum each year for four years was in the Welfare Reform and Work Bill going through Parliament, with a view for the rent reductions to be implemented from April 2016. Other government proposals, such as the extension of the Right to Buy to tenants of housing associations funded by the sale of high value Council housing, would either be introduced by Regulation or in a Housing Bill scheduled to be published in October 2015. Mr Carter explained that the consequence for Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council was dramatic, with significant projected losses for both authorities from their long-term housing business plans.

It was noted that the Shadow Officer Board for the Housing Development Agency had recently met for the first time. It had concluded that a 'soft' approach to the establishment of the Housing Development Agency as a shared service would be favourable at this stage. This would entail current employees remaining with their respective employers with a view to moving direct to a company model by the end of 2016. The Officer Board had welcomed the establishment of a Member Reference Group to oversee development of the Housing Development Agency.

Discussing the target of delivering 1,000 additional affordable homes as part of the City Deal programme, Mr Carter said that officers were already confident of securing immediate schemes and pipeline schemes that would contribute to achieving this objective. He reminded Members that Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council had their respective housing programmes in place, the County Council had its aspirations and land assets with regard to housing development, on top of the establishment of the Housing Development Agency.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, provided the Board with an update following consideration of this report by the Assembly on 7 October 2015. He reported that the Assembly had noted the changed environment for local authority social housing provision, together with the revised and more cautious approach to the establishment of the Housing Development Agency. It had also requested more information in future reports, which had been agreed by officers.

Discussing the short-term risks set out in the report under paragraph 15, Members felt that the risk should be highlighted as significant in view of the consequences of the Government's latest announcements regarding welfare reform and housing. Mr Carter accepted these sentiments but said that the current environment was testing and stretching the thinking of officers even further to ensure sustainable delivery of affordable housing provision.

Councillor Lewis Herbert, Chairman of the Executive Board, fully supported the work and determination of officers in such difficult circumstances and the progress that had been made.

The Executive Board **NOTED** the report.

11. GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL FORWARD PLAN

The Executive Board considered and **NOTED** the Greater Cambridge City Deal Forward Plan.

The Meeting ended at 3.50 p.m.
