# GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL EXECUTIVE BOARD

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board held on
Wednesday, 8 March 2017 at 4.00 p.m.

**Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Cllr Lewis Herbert (Chair) | Cambridge City Council |
| Cllr Francis Burkitt (Vice Chairman) | South Cambridgeshire District Council |
| Phil Allmendinger | University of Cambridge |
| Cllr Ian Bates | Cambridgeshire County Council |
| Mark Reeve | Local Enterprise Partnership |

**Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly in Attendance:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Councillor Roger Hickford | Joint Assembly Chairman |

**Officers/advisors:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Graham Hughes | Cambridgeshire County Council |
| Stephen Kelly | South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council |
| Hilary Holden | City Deal Partnership |
| Andrew Limb | Cambridge City Council |
| Yvonne O'Donnell | Cambridge City Council |
| Tanya Sheridan | City Deal Partnership |
| Jeremy Smith | Cambridgeshire County Council |
| Rachel Stopard | City Deal Partnership |
| Chris Tunstall | City Deal Partnership |
| Victoria Wallace | South Cambridgeshire District Council |

## 1. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence. The Chair welcomed Professor Phil Allmendinger as the new Executive Board member representing the University of Cambridge. The Chair also welcomed Councillor Roger Hickford, Chair of the City Deal Joint Assembly, to the meeting.

## 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

## 3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 January 2017 were agreed as a correct record.

## 4. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Stephen Coates was invited to ask his pre-submitted question, as detailed in the notice of public questions. In response to Mr Coates' question, the Chair made the following points:

- All governance and probity questions of the City Deal had been taken seriously and would be answered. Executive Board members and the City Deal Chief Executive were always happy to answer such queries.
- The City Deal expected all voting and non voting Executive and Joint Assembly Members to act appropriately and declare all interests. Members did not take part in decisions relating to issues in which they had a conflict of interest.
- All members were bound by the members' Code of Conduct and non voting members were bound by the Nolan Committee principles and the Joint Assembly's and Executive Board's Terms of Reference.
- The Vice Chairman offered to look through the evidence gathered, with Mr Coates. Mr Coates accepted this offer.
- The Chair stated that he was not aware of any probity issues or undeclared interests regarding the City Deal.

The other public questions received from Antony Carpen and Barbara Taylor, were taken at the relevant agenda item.

## 5. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE JOINT ASSEMBLY

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the City Deal Joint Assembly, provided updates on the issues raised by the Joint Assembly, at the relevant agenda items.

## 6. CITY DEAL PROGRESS REPORT

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director presented the report which set out the progress on the delivery of agreed projects and work streams in which the City Deal was investing. The Executive Board was informed that a meeting had taken place with Network Rail on 23 February 2017 and that a meeting with Highways England would take place later in March.

Barbara Taylor was invited to ask her pre-submitted question, as detailed in the notice of public questions. In response to Ms Taylor's question, the following points were made:

- It was envisaged that public consultations would take place in parallel for the Milton Road project on the detailed scheme design and on the associated traffic regulation orders; the latter being a statutory consultation. This would allow comments and views to be submitted by the public on scheme design and traffic regulation orders in parallel, for consideration by the Executive Board. Discussions would take place with the Local Liaison Forum before a report was presented to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in June 2017.

Councillor Roger Hickford informed the Executive Board of the discussion which had taken place at the Joint Assembly meeting, regarding this agenda item:

- The Joint Assembly had raised concern that the City Deal was repeatedly referred to as a £1 billion investment programme, but as yet there had been relatively little extra funding secured. It was felt that more emphasis should be made on leveraging more funding. Officers had informed the Joint Assembly that the City Deal had the potential to reach £1 billion.

- Concern was raised that the apprenticeship programme was not proceeding quickly enough. Joint Assembly members that formed the Skills Group, assured the Joint Assembly that activities were ongoing and were monitored and evaluated for outcomes.

In response to the update from the Joint Assembly, the City Deal Programme Director outlined the funding that was coming forward. This was envisaged to be up to £1 billion

covering a range of anticipated local investment supporting housing and employment growth. Members were also informed that regarding the skills work stream, evaluation of the Form the Future contract had taken place and further evaluation was planned.

In response to concern raised by the Vice Chairman regarding housing and planning, the Executive Board was informed that new homes were only being counted towards the target of 1000 additional homes on rural exception sites or affordable houses on 5 year land supply sites once South Cambridgeshire was running ahead of its housing trajectory for the submitted local plan, which currently was not the case. Until this was above the profile for the Local Plan trajectory, performance would remain at zero against the target. The Vice Chairman requested that future progress reports made clear where the City Deal was in terms of the 1000 additional homes target, suggesting a graph be included to make this clear.

The Vice Chairman requested that future progress reports made clear where the City Deal was on the path to reaching its target regarding apprenticeships, and how progress was being made to achieving the target. Officers agreed to work with the Local Enterprise Partnership to gather more data for the next progress report.
In response to a query regarding the Western Orbital decision point on the milestones plan, the Executive Board was informed that this would be in July 2017.
Members were informed that an organogram of City Deal staff should be available in June or July 2017, which would be provided to members.

The Vice Chairman requested that where possible, two officer names be provided in the officer lead column of the forward plan.

Rachel Stopard, City Deal Interim Chief Executive introduced Chris Tunstall as Interim City Deal Transport Director.

In response to a query regarding the possibility of leveraging funding from the private sector, the Executive Board was informed that more information on funding streams would be brought to the Executive Board at its next meeting. More information on funding streams such as S106 and CIL, was requested in the next financial report, to provide the Executive Board with a better understanding of the funding sources.

In response to a query regarding the cumulative housing trajectories outlined in Figure 1 of the report, the Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development informed the Executive Board that projections had been carried out immediately post Brexit and were pessimistic. The Executive Board requested further projection and analysis of the different funding sources.

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

## 7. 2017/18 BUDGET SETTING

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director presented the report which sought the Board's agreement to an allocation of resources for 2017/18 and for future years to support the City Deal's objectives.

Councillor Roger Hickford updated the Board on the discussions which had taken place at the Joint Assembly meeting regarding this item. He informed the Board that the Assembly had raised particular concern regarding:

- Electric vehicle charging points: The Joint Assembly asked for a further paper to be presented at its meeting in June 2017. Concerns related to value for money and that the charging points would be for taxi use only.

- South Cambridgeshire travel hubs: It was felt that there was not enough detail regarding where these would be and what these would look like.
- Strategic planning and transport framework: It was felt that not enough detail had been provided for such a large one-off spend.
- Scaling up of the Smart Cambridge programme.

The Executive Board discussed the recommendations as set out in the report:

Regarding the cycling greenways project, the Vice Chairman praised the County Council's cycling team. He informed the Executive Board that each greenway would be 5 to 6 miles long radiating out of the city to the surrounding villages, creating a network of cycling routes. Haslingfield Parish Council had expressed concern that the greenways may look unattractive. It was hoped that extra funding would be leveraged from government grants and other sources. The Board was informed that £480,000 funding would go towards the recruitment of more officers into the County Council's cycling team to work on projects. This would lead to projects being shovel ready when big investments came forward. It was envisaged that 12 projects would be undertaken in total, with six in the first phase and a further six in the second phase. Deciding upon the location of the greenways would involve much work with parish councils, local communities and potential landowners. The wider benefit of the project would be linking communities and linking homes and places of work.

Regarding the City Access project, it was clarified that this was a commitment of New Homes Bonus funding. Hilary Holden provided a brief overview of the range of projects that this would fund. Funding would also go towards funding 7.4 full time equivalent staff who would be allocated amongst the eight delivery plans that were discussed by the Executive Board at its meeting in January 2017. The Board was informed that the 7.4 full time equivalent staff would be permanent resource within the City Deal team, sitting within partner organisations, but dedicated to the City Deal work. Consultancy resource would cover secondments and support for particular pieces of work, design and implementation.

Councillor Bates expressed support for the City Access project and noting the dramatic fall in traffic during school holiday periods, advised that a starting point be to look at initiatives with schools, such as car sharing around park and ride sites.

Electric vehicle charging points were discussed:
The Head of Environmental Health and Licensing, Cambridge City Council, provided further detail on the electric vehicle charging points project:

- If all match funding was not achieved, funding from the Office of Low Emission Vehicles (OLEV) would be £300,000. If all match funding was achieved, OLEV would provide £500,000 funding.
- It was explained that the bid to OLEV specified electric taxis and private hire vehicles.
- Cambridge City Council had approved £100,000 match funding, which was awaited.
- If all funding was achieved, this would provide 41 rapid and semi rapid charging points in Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire.
- The phase 1 pilot study had found that if the infrastructure was in place, taxi operators would switch to electric and hybrid vehicles as this provided an economic benefit to them. The added benefit was that the scheme would improve air quality in the city.

The Vice Chairman expressed his support for the electric vehicle charging points, pointing out that the chargers were so expensive as they had to deliver the charge very quickly to

taxis. He advised officers look into a Westminster Council project which was converting the base of street lampposts into chargers. In response to this the Board was informed that work was being undertaken with the County Council, to look at charging points for residents with off street parking. A bid to OLEV for this was being looked into.

The Chair thanked officers for the work that had gone into this project. Councillor Roger Hickford welcomed the report and the further information received from officers at the meeting, pointing out that had the Joint Assembly been informed of this detail, they may have raised fewer concerns regarding the project. Officers were asked to summarise this information and make it available to Joint Assembly members.

The Vice Chairman reminded the Executive Board that South Cambridgeshire District Council had passed a resolution in 2016, expressing interest in a railway station at Cambridge South.

Travel hubs were discussed:

Councillor Burkitt as South Cambridgeshire District Council's Portfolio Holder for the City Deal, informed the Board that he had written to all South Cambridgeshire parish councils to seek their views on the idea of rural travel hubs in villages. Foxton, Meldreth, Shepreth, Whittlesford, Swavesey and Oakington had expressed interest in a travel hub being located in these villages. It was pointed out that all these villages were located near existing travel infrastructure. Councillor Burkitt informed the Board that he would be establishing who the landowners of potential locations of travel hubs were and would be seeking advice from South Cambridgeshire District Council planners regarding whether or not it was likely that planning permission would be granted for these. He felt that this was a practical bottom up planning and land ownership approach.

Councillor Bates expressed his support for travel hubs and felt that Network Rail extensions to some of these stations could add weight. He advised starting with the areas where extensions were planned.

Mark Reeve spoke in support of this and asked that the City Deal consider looking into achieving a return on investment.

The Greater Cambridge strategic planning and transport framework was discussed:
Councillor Bates wanted to ensure the brief for this was wide and could be captured by the Combined Authority. In support of this Mark Reeve advised that it was ensured that this did not duplicate but supported what was being done elsewhere. Stephen Kelly, Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development, Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils, reassured the Board that dialogue was taking place to ensure this fitted with the wider context.

Councillor Hickford informed the Board that the Joint Assembly's challenge to the City Deal had been regarding who should be leading this. The Chairman advised that the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development and his team, were leading on this.

The City Centre spaces and movement framework was discussed:
The Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development explained how this fit with the planning and transport framework. He made the following points:

- Concerns regarding how the city was managed and curated long term in terms of spaces, amenities and roads across the city were being engaged with.
- Much dialogue was taking place regarding quality of space and the choices made around road space and how people move around the city.

- In response to a query from Councillor Burkitt, the Board was informed that the reason for the funding bid was for investment in significant external thinking regarding the quality of the city and the quality of space. The ambition was to talk to the best thinkers in these areas and the City Deal would be informed of who these were.

The scaling up of the Smart Cambridge programme was discussed:
Councillor Bates informed the Board that an extensive paper on this was being presented to the 9 March 2017 Economy and Environment Committee meeting https://cmis.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/ccc_live/Meetings/tabid/70/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/397/Meeting/180/Committee/5/Default.aspx

The Executive Board was informed that a more detailed update on this would be provided at the September 2017 meeting. The City Deal Programme Director advised that there would be a need for dedicated staff to write the bids and scale up programmes. An update was requested on this for the June 2017 meeting.

Residents' parking schemes within Cambridge City were discussed:

The Executive Board was keen for work to progress on this in May 2017 and decided that this be moved to the list of projects for allocation of resource, rather than being on the list of initiatives to be considered later in the year.

The City Deal Executive Board:

a) **AGREED** to allocate additional or new resource to:

(i) Developing up to 12 cycling 'greenways' in Cambridge City and 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.

(xii) Implementation of residents' parking schemes within Cambridge City (indicative maximum of £1.0m over 3 years).

b) **AGREED** to consider later in the year the following indicative request and to develop a detailed business case to enable Board decisions:

(i) 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).

c) **NOTED**:

- 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 asked his pre-submitted question as detailed in the notice of public questions. In response to this, Graham Hughes, Executive Director Economy,Transport and Environment, Cambridgeshire County Council, made the following points:

- The City Deal and Cambridge Ahead was supporting research to explore the opportunities for an 'Advanced Very Rapid Transit' (AVRT) system for the Greater

Cambridge area. The outcome of the research would help future proof ongoing investments and find cost-effective solutions to the city's transport issues, building on current and planned bus infrastructure. The work was one of several studies undertaken as part of the Smarter Cambridge programme.

- The Cambridge-Haverhill rail corridor cost was very significant with a very low benefit to cost ratio (BCR). Due to this it was not being pursued. It was recognised that if the route was extended, there would be more passengers however the cost of providing the service would be more. The cheapest rail option would cost £390 million, with a BCR of 0.99.
- Consultation would take place on the A1307 scheme. Further engagement would take place with the public, businesses and the Local Liaison Forum. There would continue to be opportunities for the public to engage with and scrutinise the proposals as they came forward.

In response to a query from the Chair, the Board was informed that the publication of the study on the AVRT was expected within the following months. The Chair added that the Executive Board and Joint Assembly would need to consider the priorities for tranche 2 projects and would commission further feasibility studies.

The Chair allowed Mr Carpen to ask a supplementary question. Mr Carpen asked officers to engage with Suffolk and Essex County Councils to look at what joint funding may be available and other funding that could be leveraged. The Chair assured Mr Carpen that the City Deal was committed to this dialogue.

Graham Hughes presented the report and set out the key results of the public consultation on the A1307,the majority of respondents to which supported the concepts of improved bus, cycle and walking infrastructure, with strong support indicated for each of the key concepts and principles of the options. Since the consultation closed, technical work and further modelling had been undertaken.The Executive Board was assured that modelling had been updated to include all planned development and growth to 2031 in South Cambridgeshire, Cambridge City, East Cambridgeshire, Huntingdonshire and Haverhill. Mr Hughes stressed that the options were at a very early stage of development, were very broad and needed to be refined. Significant further public engagement was proposed in the run up to the consultation in June 2017.

Councillor Tony Orgee updated the Board on the Local Liaison Forum (LLF) meeting which had discussed the A1307 proposals on 20 February 2017:

- Councillor Orgee informed the Board that the report had been late which had led to the LLF members coming to the meeting without any background knowledge.
- The LLF supported the road safety improvements to the east of Linton, though more detail was wanted.
- Issues with Linton were raised; the LLF pointed out that traffic queued in both directions yet the proposed bus lane was not two way.
- The LLF advised that improvements needed to be made to the traffic lights outside the village college.
- The LLF expressed disbelief at the proposals to narrow the most narrow part of Linton High Street.
- There was support for the improvements to the Babraham to Linton cycleway. There was support for replacing steps with ramps on the A11 bridge crossing and it was felt the safety railings on the A11 bridge needed to be higher.
- The LLF had issues with all of the proposed park and ride sites.
- Concerns were raised regarding the Shelford Bottom roundabout.
- The inbound bus lane from the park and ride to Shelford Bottom was noted, however there was no bus lane outbound.

- Clarity was wanted around whether the solution to the linkage of the park and ride and the biomedical sites, was on or off road.
- It was felt that the focus of the study may be too narrow, with no mention of the Genome Campus.
- Whether there had been enough contact with neighbouring local authorities and landowners was questioned.
- The LLF questioned whether this was the right place for an outer ring park and ride or whether the park and ride should be situated further out.
- The LLF called for a pause to allow for further work to be done on the details of the proposals.

Concern was raised by Councillors Orgee and Hickford regarding whether planned growth had been taken into account, as well as the development that had been approved but that was not in the local plans. Councillor Hickford pointed out that local plans were four to five years old. Councillor Orgee pointed out that there had been substantial planning approvals in Linton in addition to what was in the Local Plan. In response to this Mr Hughes pointed out that:

- Modelling was only ever an approximation, however, as far as was possible, it had taken into account all planning consents.
- The consultants were confident that the modelling picked up all of these issues.
- As coding of local plan allocations took account of granted consents, this was taken into account in the model. However it may not have been possible to take into account planning consents that were given as little as a month before the model was run.

In response to clarity being sought on the A1307 Strategy Group, the Board was informed that the group was looking at dualling the road between Haverhill and Fourwentways, as well as taking into account the A505. The Board was informed that the A1307 proposals would not become obsolete if the dualling that was being considered by the A1307 Strategy Group went ahead. Mr Hughes reiterated the priority to improve the A1307 and informed the Board that a joined up approach was being taken.

Councillor Roger Hickford updated the Board on the Joint Assembly's discussions regarding this item, informing the Board of the Assembly's proposal to delay the public consultation until September 2017. This was to allow for officers to undertake at least three half day workshops to allow community input into the process. These would start to take place before May 2017 and would be with a range of representative people.

Councillor Bates advised that it was important to ensure that the Haverhill group were made aware of what was happening in terms of the City Deal and what might happen with the Combined Authority.

The Vice Chairman was keen to ensure that new options could be added to the preferred options list and requested that another option be added to consider how people got from the Addenbrooke's site into Cambridge. Councillor Burkitt proposed wording be added to recommendation (b) to ensure the Executive Board was not too restricted by the options. Following discussion of this, it was agreed that the wording be amended to 'develop and refine them and other options'.

The Vice Chairman proposed and it was agreed that all three voting members of the Executive Board would sign off the consultation materials.

The City Deal Executive Board:

a) **NOTED** the draft consultation report for publication on the Greater Cambridge City Deal website.

b) Reviewed the preferred options and **APPROVED** further technical work to develop and refine them and other 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) **ENDORSED** a second public consultation exercise on the preferred options to commence in September 2017 after further workshops have taken place with the Local Liaison Forum and councillors, and **AGREED** that consultation materials be signed off by the voting members of the Executive Board.

(d) **APPROVED** 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

Andrew Limb, Head of Corporate Strategy, Cambridge City Council, presented the report which sought the Executive Board's input to help shape the key themes that Greater Cambridge partners wished to emphasise in response to the Government's Industrial Strategy.

Councillor Hickford informed the Board that Joint Assembly members had suggested that the City Deal's response be coordinated with all the other organisations that would also be submitting a response, to ensure alignment. That clustering was a big factor in the area's success should be emphasised in the response.

Professor Allmendinger advised that the University of Cambridge's Pro-Vice Chancellor was preparing the university's response and advised coordination with this.

Councillor Burkitt advised that closing the skills gap and enabling jobs and opportunities to be available for local people, should be highlighted, as Cambridge had been described as one of the most unequal cities in the country.

The Executive Board agreed that responses should be coordinated and recognise each other.

Mr Limb set out his intentions which supported the views of the Executive Board Members. He highlighted Cambridge's track record in research and development and of collaboration, which he felt needed to be emphasised and maximised. The Board thanked Mr Limb for his work on this.

The City Deal Executive Board **DELEGATED** 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 was noted. The venue for the meeting would be changed from Cambourne to Cambridge.

---

**The Meeting ended at 6.50 p.m.**

---