



**GREATER
CAMBRIDGE
CITY DEAL**

Securing future prosperity

GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL JOINT ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly held on
Thursday, 29 September 2016 at 4.00 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 Dave Baigent	Cambridge City Council
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
Sir Michael Marshall	Marshall Group
Claire Ruskin	Cambridge Network
Andy Williams	AstraZeneca
Helen Valentine	Anglia Ruskin University
Dr John Wells	Cancer Research UK Cambridge Institute

Officers/advisors:

Sarah Heywood	Cambridgeshire County Council
Bob Menzies	Cambridgeshire County Council
Stuart Walmsley	Cambridgeshire County Council
Aaron Blowers	City Deal Partnership
Beth Durham	City Deal Partnership
Joanna Harrall	City Deal Partnership
Tanya Sheridan	City Deal Partnership
Graham Watts	South Cambridgeshire District Council

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Mark Robertson and Councillor Tim Wotherspoon.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 25 August 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Helen Valentine, in respect of item 8, declared that she had been appointed onto the Joint Assembly by the University of Cambridge but that she was not employed by the University and was not obliged to represent its views.

Dr John Wells declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in item 8 as he was employed by the University of Cambridge. He made the point that he was not in any way involved in the University's decision-making processes regarding this scheme, but intended to leave the meeting room prior to consideration of the item to avoid any perception of undue influence. Dr Wells also declared that he had been appointed onto the Joint Assembly by the University of Cambridge, not as a direct representative of the University, and that he was a resident of Hardwick.

Councillor Bridget Smith, in respect of item 8, declared that she was the Vice-Chairman of the A428 Local Liaison Forum.

4. QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

It was noted that all public questions that had been received related to item 8. In view of this, it was agreed that questions would be put as part of considering that item.

5. PETITIONS

No petitions for consideration by the Joint Assembly since the previous meeting had been received.

6. CITY DEAL FORWARD PLAN

The Joint Assembly considered the City Deal Forward Plan.

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, presented the Forward Plan and reported that the City Deal scheme regarding the Chisholm Trail had been considered by the County Council's Economy and Environment Committee, at the same time as the Abbey Chesterton bridge.

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

7. CITY DEAL PROGRESS REPORT

The Joint Assembly considered the City Deal progress report.

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, presented the report and highlighted that the next stage of public consultation for the Histon Road and Milton Road schemes would need to move to allow community design workshops to take place in advance to inform the proposals and facilitate stakeholder engagement. This meant that the consultations on the detailed design for the two schemes would now take place in the first half of 2017, rather than November and December 2016.

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

8. A428 CAMBOURNE TO CAMBRIDGE BETTER BUS JOURNEYS: SELECTION OF A CATCHMENT AREA FOR DETAILED SCHEME DEVELOPMENT

NOTE - Dr John Wells, having declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in this item, left the meeting at this stage of proceedings.

The Joint Assembly considered a report which set out the next stage of the A428 Cambourne to Cambridge Better Bus Journeys City Deal scheme and recommended a catchment area and Park and Ride location. The report also sought to develop a specific route alignment within that catchment area, using the Transport Appraisal Guidance,

together with an associated new Park and Ride site and proposed that both of these aspects be approved for public consultation in the summer 2017.

Bob Menzies, Director of Strategy and Development at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report and provided a brief presentation to Members. It was noted that this scheme supported a number of significant local policies, including Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans, the Local Transport Plan, the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire and the Long Term Transport Plan.

Mr Menzies reported that the recommended option contained within the report was the best option from the perspective of the City Deal's objectives taking into account the longer term view of the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans, including the significant proposed development at Cambourne, Cambourne West and Bourn Airfield. It represented the fastest and most reliable route, equating to a 28 minute return journey between Cambourne and Cambridge, and was the route best positioned to enable effective transport into the city. The wider economic benefits were estimated as being £679 million over a 30 year period with the scheme estimated to cost £142 million to deliver. He acknowledged that the option proposed was the most expensive option and that there were significant environmental issues to consider, but he believed that the investment would be worthwhile and that the sensitivities regarding the environmental aspects of the scheme could be mitigated against. He highlighted that the route would be designed and developed at ground level and in many areas dug into the ground in order that its visual impact was kept to a minimum.

Referring to the busway aspect of the proposal, Mr Menzies reported that evidence elsewhere in the county suggested that this would encourage development in areas such as Cambourne and be seen as an attractive quality.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, invited those members of the public who had provided notice to present their questions. Questions were therefore asked and answered as follows:

Question by Dr Hans Hagen

Dr Hans Hagen said that Cambridge Biomedical Campus partners welcomed the Cambourne to Cambridge Better Bus Journeys assessment and saw it as a positive step forward for those staff currently living in the A428 area and the 2,000 new Papworth Hospital and AstraZeneca staff who would be commuting from the west of Cambridge to the Campus from October 2017 onwards.

He asked for clarification as to how the current plans for this scheme would ultimately link to an effective sustainable transport route from the A428 corridor to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. Dr Hagen also asked for an update on how City Deal tranche 1 plans could enable staff commuting along the A428 corridor to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus from October 2017 to travel by bus.

Mr Menzies confirmed that the issues referred to in the question were part of the City Deal's strategy to build wider links across the city of Cambridge, with the Cambridge Biomedical Campus being a really important part of that. He highlighted that the city centre access proposals were currently being engaged upon with the Western Orbital proposals part of the City Deal's tranche 2 programme. The City Deal would seek to combine these schemes to create a sustainable route from Cambourne to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Mr Menzies reported that partners were pushing forward with these schemes as quickly as they reasonably could.

Councillor Hickford asked how people were being kept informed of progress.

Mr Menzies acknowledged that it was challenging to ensure that all interested persons were informed of the progress of specific schemes, but said that a key place was the City Deal website where information relating to all of the City Deal's different projects was published.

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, also referred to a recently launched e-letter and encouraged all Members of the Joint Assembly and members of the public to subscribe to it provide any feedback on it.

Question by Stephen Coates

Stephen Coates referred to a 2008 High Court case on a proposal to allocate land north of Barton Road on the West Fields for housing development, which he stated that the Coton corridor was the most sensitive location on the Western side of the city in terms of its impact on the setting of the historic part of Cambridge. He also referred to extensive heritage and ecological information that had been supplied, which he claimed had been largely ignored, proving that the West Fields would never qualify under the scheme design criteria as a route alignment, given that such a route would harm the landscape and severely impact ecological and heritage assets with a devastating impact on Cambridge as a historical city and potential World Heritage Site. Mr Coates therefore asked the Joint Assembly to narrow the catchment area of option 3a to exclude the West Fields, south of the Coton Footpath, thereby safeguarding the Coton corridor right the way to Grange Road. Accordingly, he asked for Grange Farm and the land either side of the Bin Brook owned by Jesus College to be removed from the catchment area of 3a.

Mr Coates believed that if the route alignment was taken through the West Cambridge site along Charles Babbage Road it should also be possible to route any bus road above the Coton Orchard to preserve the setting of this critical greenbelt village. He shared the concerns of Coton Parish Council and Cambridge Past, Present and Future that the Park and Ride location choice of Madingley Mulch was damaging for the landscape and asked the Joint Assembly to find an alternative, less intrusive location. Mr Coates also called for the Assembly to consider removing the yellow zone of option 3, as illustrated on the plans contained within the report, which may account for southerly locations of the red zone of catchment area 3a.

Mr Coates thought there was risk of judicial review given the extremely sensitive nature of the area and the 2008 High Court judgement relating to the Coton corridor.

Mr Menzies acknowledged that the catchment area had been set quite wide on the basis that partners had to demonstrate that all reasonable routes and options had been fully considered. Detailed work to establish information relating to the environmental issues referred to in the question would take place as part of the scheme's next stage. He therefore advised against restricting the catchment area at this point.

Question by Robin Pellew

Robin Pellew was of the opinion that of all possible sites for locating a new Park and Ride, location 3 on Figure 4 at Chrome Lea must represent one of the worst. It comprised the upper slope and shoulder of Madingley Hill, one of the most prominent landscape features in South-West Cambridgeshire. He said that the Park and Ride would therefore be a ghastly carbuncle on the landscape that would be floodlit at night and felt that it appeared to have been selected purely for transport planning and engineering reasons, with no consideration given to the landscape and environmental damage it would cause. Mr

Pellew, representing Cambridge Past, Present and Future, urged the City Deal not to commit such folly.

He reported that Cambridge Past, Present and Future had highlighted that the whole scheme, including the Park and Ride, must comply with the principles of sustainable development as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework, which he said it manifestly did not at the moment. He therefore asked the Joint Assembly to recommend that the Executive Board instructed its consultants to reconsider all possible sites for the Park and Ride, including around Scotland Farm, but this time to give equal status to the social and environmental considerations as to the access and engineering criteria.

It was noted that Mr Pellew spoke on behalf of the Planning Committee of Cambridge Past, Present and Future.

Mr Menzies responded by saying that there were environmental issues with all potential Park and Ride sites and that this site had been recommended on strategic grounds.

Question by Councillor Rod Cantrill

Councillor Cantrill made the point that this scheme failed to meet the criteria the City Deal had established to assess such schemes on value for money, environmental and social distributional impact and deliverability, only passing the criteria in relation to contribution to objectives. He was of the opinion that this was particularly the case on the part of the scheme that crossed the fields north of Coton and the West Fields of Newnham, stating that the scheme was also in direct contradiction with the position taken by the City Council's Local Plan regarding the status of the West Fields as one of the most sensitive elements of the greenbelt around the city.

Councillor Cantrill therefore called on the Joint Assembly to recommend to the City Deal Executive Board that the proposed scheme was not progressed at this time, but that other options were explored in more detail and that any scheme for the A428/A1303 corridor was considered as part of the City Deal's tranche 2 programme.

Mr Menzies explained that the critical point was that the recommended scheme best met the City Deal's objectives and that the other options, as set out in the report, did not come close to delivering the same benefits. Referring to planning and the relevant planning policies, he reported that it was very clear that transport infrastructure could be built in the greenbelt when properly considered, whereas other development could not. He highlighted a number of existing informal crossing points in the area and the low impact he anticipated this scheme having on the landscape, adding that he did not accept the view that this scheme would lead to significant additional development in the greenbelt.

Tanya Sheridan recalled that the Executive Board had prioritised schemes for the first tranche of City Deal on the basis of their contribution to economic growth, including jobs, housing growth and deliverability. The part of the Cambourne to Cambridge scheme to the east of Madingley Mulch had scored particularly highly and was therefore prioritised for tranche 1, whilst the section to the west was within the tranche 2 programme based on the decision that it made sense to develop the whole scheme together. It was also noted that the value for money criteria did not just depend on the benefit/cost ratio, but also the economic growth benefits which in this case were significant.

Question by Dr Gabriel Fox

Speaking as Vice-Chairman of Coton Parish Council, Dr Gabriel Fox reported that the preferred option routed the busway via Coton village and would pass within ten feet of the nearest houses. He was also concerned that there would be a Park and Ride as big as that in Trumpington next to Coton which would dominate the village day and night and, being on a significant slope, be impossible to screen. Dr Fox said, therefore, that this would cause damage to the village of an almost unimaginable scale.

Dr Fox said that if the proposal was as a result of a rational decision, then it would be slightly easier to accept. However, the preferred option was the most expensive, had the lowest benefit/cost ratio, the highest environmental damage score, wreaked the most social damage and was by far the most opposed by local people. He added that all of this would be to secure a two minute improvement on journey times. Dr Fox indicated that proceeding with this option would leave Coton Parish Council with no option but to seek legal advice on judicial review with immediate effect.

Dr Fox asked why there seemed to have been so little effort in seeking a solution on Madingley Rise. He believed the footprint of the road to be wide enough to accommodate any number of options and that the current bridge could be utilised, citing a number of examples of options which could achieve a couple of minutes saved in journey times but realised at a fraction of the financial and environmental cost. He therefore asked, on behalf of the Parish Council, that further investigation of this, and other options, take place before any decision was taken to proceed further with option 3a.

Mr Menzies reported that he and the team had looked at the potential of using Madingley Rise as an option, as suggested in the question, and disagreed that there was room to provide the necessary infrastructure, stating that complex junctions and issues with access would also need to be taken into consideration. In looking at this as a potential route, the suggested approach would see the route run parallel with the M11 and then cross the motorway, resulting in the need for a very long bridge at least double the size of the bridge included in the recommended option, as well as acquiring some gardens and dwellings to accommodate the route. He therefore recommended against doing that.

Councillor Hickford invited Helen Bradbury, Chairman of the A428 Local Liaison Forum to provide a report on the outcomes of its meeting held on 26 September 2016. Copies of the minutes of that meeting had been circulated to Members of the Joint Assembly and she reported that 19 elected members and three officers had attended the meeting.

It was noted that the Local Liaison Forum did not support the corridor with the catchment area as recommended by officers, stating that it was the most unpopular option having been voted against by residents in June. The Forum was therefore surprised that this had been put forward as the recommended option. In addition, she reiterated the points made by the earlier public speakers that the preferred option was the most expensive, met the least of the City Deal's own criteria, had the most risk attached to it, was the most environmentally damaging and impacted negatively on the most people. She did not think that all of this was worth the estimated two minutes improved journey time that would be delivered as a result of the scheme.

Helen Bradbury also reiterated the points made in relation to the 2008 High Court Order regarding the Coton corridor, stating that the recommended option went against that Order and would therefore be open to legal challenge. She reported that many people believed a transport infrastructure scheme in this area would lead to development and stated that the Local Liaison Forum was supportive of a catchment area north of Coton Orchard.

Helen Bradbury presented the resolutions agreed at the meeting of the Local Liaison Forum as follows:

Resolution one:

"That the Executive Board removes the whole of the A428 busway project from phase 1 to phase 2 in order to give sufficient time for a full assessment to be made of the success, or otherwise, of the current congestion tackling strategy especially in relation to the points at which a busway will join the current road network.

More research is needed into the benefits of the busway and how it will tie in with the Girton Interchange and the Western Orbital route."

Resolution two:

"The Local Liaison Forum accepts the necessity for a public transport corridor on the A428 but has serious reservations about option 3 and option 3a on environmental and social, value for money and public consultation grounds. It asks the City Deal to consider other options where the environmental and social impact criteria are given equal weight within economic benefits and marginally shortened journey times."

Councillor Hickford reported that officers had already responded to the points raised in resolutions one and two in answer to public questions.

Resolution three:

"The Local Liaison Forum cannot support option 3 or 3a while the West Fields area to the south of the footpath, the Coton Countryside Reserve and the area to the south of the Polhill Garden Centre are included in the catchment area."

Councillor Hickford asked officers what the consequences would be of taking these areas out of the catchment area. Mr Menzies said that without fully evaluating all of the options it would not be possible to reach a conclusion and that this would in fact pre-empt the next stage of the process where the significant detail surrounding some of these issues, particularly around environmental impact, would be investigated. Assessment of the different routes was necessary in order that evaluations of route options could take place, the outcomes of which would then go out to public consultation.

It was noted that a resolution four was not presented.

Resolution five:

"This resolution calls on the City Deal and Cambridgeshire County Council to release all documents relating to their negotiations with Highways England, including correspondence, minutes of meetings, survey data and modelling projections that show the vigour with which these negotiations were pursued and which constitute the evidence base for Highways England to take its decision".

It was noted that this resolution related to the Girton Interchange and the fact that its reconfiguration had not been included within the A14 upgrade. Mr Menzies reported that this was a long running issue with the scope of Girton Interchange having been reduced significantly. He agreed to share any previous correspondence and information to the Local Liaison Forum, as requested.

Resolution six:

"The Local Liaison Form believes that there is sufficient width for a high quality busway and cycle facility to follow the route of the existing road from the A428/A1303 junction to the M11 junction and requests that the City Deal Executive Board explore this option in more detail".

Resolution seven:

"We ask Cambridge University to remove itself from the Board of the City Deal for the Cambourne to Cambridge busway decision only, to reduce the conflict of interest over its land development objectives.

The Local Liaison Forum is concerned that the University is both influencing the route decision and promoting land development to the local inspector".

Councillor Hickford made the point that this was entirely up to the individual Board Member.

Resolution eight:

"The proposal to place the possible new Park and Ride site close to the Maddingley Mulch roundabout is not acceptable to Maddingley and Coton parishes. It is strongly recommended by both parishes that the County Council reconsider this and we support that the new Park and Ride site should be built at the Scotland Farm junction on the A428.

If this is not possible, the Local Liaison Forum considers that Park and Ride site 2 would be significantly less damaging and is the only one that it could support."

Resolution nine:

"The Local Liaison Forum requests that the 18 month trial period for road closures as part of the tackling Cambridge congestion proposals must be monitored and measured carefully, before and during the process, to see if introduction of these measures does meet the 15% traffic reduction projected."

Mr Menzies made the point that the scheme was still in the very early stages of its development with the most critical part being the scheme's statutory approval. Measures such as the Peak Congestion Control Points would have been implemented prior to the final decision of this scheme having been made, so the impact of those measures could be taken into account as part of that decision-making process. Stopping this scheme now would push the project back until at least 2030 in terms of its deliverability and anticipated outcomes.

Helen Bradbury referred to the Girton Interchange, saying that this was a main interchange but that it restricted people from going west without having to travel down a narrow hill and wait in traffic to join the road into Cambridge. She found it incredible that this was not being addressed or changed as part of the scheme and reiterated that existing infrastructure could be used in areas such as Maddingley Rise.

Discussion ensued on the available width at Maddingley Rise, which it was understood ranged from 19 metres at the narrowest point to 25 metres at the widest point. Mr Menzies agreed to undertake further work, including a full topographical survey, in respect of Maddingley Rise and share the outcomes with the Local Liaison Forum. He also explained that Highways England was looking at the Girton Interchange in the context of

the Oxford to Cambridge Expressway.

Councillor Hickford referred Members of the Joint Assembly to the report, which recommended that the Executive Board:

- (I) Noted the accompanying Option Assessment Report, the further background papers containing the Outline Strategic Business Case, and the Map Appendix to the report.
- (II) Agreed, in principle, that a segregated route between Cambourne and Cambridge, with a Park & Ride near the Madingley Mulch roundabout, best met the strategic objectives of the City Deal and the City Deal Agreement, given the wider economic benefits.
- (III) Instructed officers to undertake further appraisal on:
 - (a) Possible specific route alignments within catchment Area 3a, with catchment area 3 as an alternative if (but only if) option 3a proved unviable, noting that both would connect with and potentially through Cambridge West.
 - (b) A new Park & Ride at location 3, as set out in the report.

(with (a) and (b) above being in accordance with the scheme design criteria set out in paragraph 12 of the report, and within established environmental and planning policies)
- (IV) Delegated to Cambridgeshire County Council's Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment:

Authority to:

- (a) Act with input from the A428/A1303 Local Liaison Forum, the Parish Councils and Residents' Associations along catchment areas 3a and 3, interested members of the Joint Assembly and interested Councillors from the County, City and District Councils.
- (b) Act in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Executive Board.

Responsibility to:

- (c) Identify a specific route alignment(s) within catchment area 3a (or, if necessary, catchment area 3).
- (d) Identify a footprint for a Park and Ride at location 3.
- (e) Undertake a public consultation on that specific route alignment and Park and Ride location, planned for May-July 2017.
- (f) Subsequent to that public consultation, provide a report to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board, targeted for November 2017, containing a recommendation and full outline business case for a specific route alignment and one Park & Ride location, that would then subsequently be developed in detail and an application made for Statutory Approval in 2018.

Councillor Tim Bick reflected on the key reason behind the City Deal agreement being made, which he felt was to enable homes to be built for people so that they could work in the area and in turn contribute to the growth of the local economy. He surmised, therefore, that the purpose of this scheme was about connecting up communities and emphasised the importance of a joined up approach in this respect, with joint decision making, taking into account Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire's Local Plans being essential. He highlighted the issue of benefit/cost ratios and sought clarity as to why some of the benefit/cost ratios set out in the report were so low and what the realistic prospect was of them increasing.

Mr Menzies explained that there were a number of factors influencing the benefit/cost ratio rates at this stage of the process that had to be taken into account. For example, the ratios accounted for a very conservative level of growth in certain areas as only those figures contained within the Local Plans, and for the plan periods, could be used. This equated to 1,250 homes in West Cambourne, even though the planning application that had been submitted contained double that number. It was noted that the model used for this data was in the process of being updated, with the revised version expected to contain significant differences particularly in respect of large developments that had taken place over the last ten years, such as Cambourne. The Cambridge Access Study had also not been taken into account as part of the benefit/cost ratio analysis. Mr Menzies also explained the process of Optimism Bias that had been added to specific schemes, a factor of the Department for Transport, which in some cases was as high as 38%. As schemes became more refined this Optimism Bias would decrease.

Debating, in general, the recommendations contained within the report, the following points were noted:

- Councillor Bridget Smith highlighted that South Cambridgeshire's Local Plan was predicated on the need to preserve the greenbelt, which was contrary to the recommended option set out in the report. She was concerned that this scheme would cause damage to places where people were currently living and said that the Joint Assembly had to consider what it could do to remove some of that and limit the damage. Councillor Smith added that areas were being put forward that would never be included as part of a final scheme, so called for them to be removed from the process, acknowledging that a lot of people were currently living with uncertainty;
- Councillor Dave Baigent had listened to the arguments regarding journey times and said that the key aspects of journey times that needed to improve were predictability and reliability. People needed to know, accurately, what time buses were due to arrive to pick them up and how long it would take to get to their destinations, so he felt that a direct route was vital. Councillor Baigent agreed that Scotland Farm should be considered further as a possible alternative Park and Ride site and called for other options to be considered north of the American Cemetery. He was also of the view that a bridge over the M11 should be considered, with the opinion that all of these suggestions were credible;
- Councillor Hickford reflected on the views of the Local Liaison Forum in respect of the suggested Park and Ride site at Madingley Mulch and was in agreement that it did seem to him to be the wrong site. With regard to people's views regarding the West Fields, he understood their concerns but also appreciated that all options were being left open;

- Councillor Bick asked how an extra northern bridge over the M11 could be created as part of this scheme. Mr Menzies reported that this suggestion was represented in option 4 of the report and would be challenging due to it being located north of the American Cemetery and would mean the route coming back south via Madingley Road which would mean it was not a direct route. He also cited another difficulty being the route's close proximity to the American Cemetery from an environmental impact perspective. Councillor Bick understood that option 4 in the report did not include the development of a bridge and asked whether it would be worthwhile to consider this. Mr Menzies confirmed that discussions had been held with the American Cemetery and English Heritage who had indicated that they would not be supportive of such a proposal. He also made the point that the bridge would not take traffic anywhere other than into a Park and Ride site, so would not add any benefit;
- Helen Valentine made the point that a segregated route would be the best solution to support the need for journeys to be reliable, adding that significant capacity and resilience was necessary. She was of the opinion that it would not be possible to make a step change in capacity that did not have some adverse impacts;
- Claire Ruskin said that consistency of travel times was more important than reducing journey times and sympathised with the existing infrastructure.

Councillor Bridget Smith proposed an amendment to recommendation (III) (a) of the report so that the paragraph read:

"possible specific route alignments within catchment areas 3a and 4 (with the possibility of a bridge to the north of the existing M11 bridge), noting that both may connect with and potentially go through Cambridge West, in accordance with the scheme design criteria set out in paragraph 12 of the report, and within established environmental and planning policies."

She was of the opinion that this would allow a busway coming to the south of Madingley Road with a less detrimental impact on the West Fields and allowed the route to continue north of Madingley Road as well as via the north-west Cambridge site. Councillor Smith felt that this approach responded to the concerns of local people who had indicated how precious this particular area was.

Councillor Dave Baigent seconded the amendment.

Councillor Maurice Leeke highlighted paragraph 25 of the report which referred to concerns raised in the consultation about the impact of a route north of Madingley Road on the 800 Acre Wood and the American Cemetery and he agreed with these findings, with the view that this would represent a longer and less acceptable route which added problems rather than solving them.

Councillor Baigent responded by saying that this amendment only sought to recommend that these options be worked up, ensuring that more detail became available.

Voting on the amendment, with 8 votes in favour, 3 votes against and 1 abstention, the amendment was carried.

Councillor Smith proposed an amendment to recommendation (IV) (a) of the report so that it referred to catchment areas 3a and 4 rather than catchment area 3.

This amendment was unanimously agreed and was therefore carried.

Councillor Tim Bick proposed an amendment to recommendation (III) (b) of the report so that the paragraph read:

"commissioning an environmental impact assessment of Park and Ride site 3 to bring to the Assembly and Board at the earliest feasible opportunity, enabling a realistic view to be taken about the potential for mitigation; in the meantime holding the other options, including Scotland Farm, under review".

In response to the amendment, Mr Menzies reported that a full environmental impact assessment would be carried out and that this could not be done in isolation and had to be undertaken on a detailed, designed scheme.

Councillor Bick understood why option 3 had been recommended but was concerned that the environmental cost was very high, saying that the danger of allowing the process to continue to take place by that stage could mean that the City Deal was committing itself to option 3. He was therefore of the view that the amendment, as proposed, would assist Members of the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in reaching a decision regarding option 3.

Andy Williams understood why Scotland Farm was a preferred option for a Park and Ride site for this scheme. Rather than exclude option 3 altogether he was keen for a comparison to be made available for all available options, setting out the advantages and disadvantages of each which he felt would then be able to assist in discussions around what compromises people may be prepared to make.

Mr Menzies said that this proposal could be taken to the next stage of environment works and be reported back in the spring 2017, although he emphasised that this would not consist of a full environmental impact assessment.

Councillor Bick, in agreeing with this approach, withdrew his amendment and proposed a further amendment to replace recommendation (III) (b) of the report with the following:

"new Park & Ride locations 1, 2 and 3, as set out in Figure 3 of the report, and also Scotland Farm, via comparison."

This amendment was unanimously agreed and was therefore carried.

Councillor Bridget Smith proposed an amendment to recommendation (II) of the report so that the paragraph read:

"Agree in principle that a wholly or partly segregated bus route between Cambourne and Cambridge, with the possibility of the potential for a segregated, cross country super cycleway running close to or through the key villages between Bourne Airfield and the M11 best meets the strategic objectives of the City Deal and the City Deal Agreement, given the wider economic benefits."

Councillor Maurice Leeke seconded the amendment.

Discussion ensued on the feasibility of developing a segregated cycleway in addition to a segregated busway. Officers agreed to investigate this aspect and inform the Joint Assembly and Executive Board through further reporting as to where this could or could not work.

Voting on the amendment, with 10 votes in favour and 2 abstentions, the amendment was carried.

Councillor Bridget Smith also put forward the following suggestions, for noting:

- to include in the final proposals the continuation of the cycle route from Cambourne West to St Neots main line railway station;
- to include in the final proposal a commitment that buses using the new busway continued on from Cambourne to St Neots main line railway station.

Councillor Bick proposed an amendment to add the following additional recommendation:

"Request officers to:

- (a) Ensure designs for the Western Orbital bus route, the bus route through north-west Cambridge to the Science Park, and the management of buses in the city centre fully integrate with this project.
- (b) Seek to deliver all these schemes as close in time as possible to the eastern section of the A428 Cambridge to Cambourne scheme."

This amendment was unanimously agreed and was therefore carried.

Councillor Bick proposed an amendment to add the following additional recommendation as (c) to recommendation IV of the report:

"Bring back the result of (a) and (b) to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board for approval prior to release for public consultation."

Tanya Sheridan highlighted that it would be necessary to push back the timescales in terms of the scheme's overall project management if the Executive Board accepted this additional recommendation.

This amendment was unanimously agreed and was therefore carried.

Voting on the substantive motion, the Joint Assembly unanimously **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board:

- (1) Notes the accompanying Option Assessment Report, the further background papers containing the Outline Strategic Business Case, and the Map Appendix to the Report.
- (2) Agrees in principle that a wholly or partly segregated bus route between Cambourne and Cambridge, with the possibility of the potential for a segregated, cross country super cycleway running close to or through the key villages between Bourne Airfield and the M11 best meets the strategic objectives of the City Deal and the City Deal Agreement, given the wider economic benefits.
- (3) Instructs officers to undertake further appraisal on:
 - (a) possible specific route alignments within Catchment Areas 3a and 4 (with the possibility of a bridge to the north of the existing M11 bridge), noting that both may connect with and potentially go through Cambridge West, in accordance with the scheme design criteria set out in Paragraph 12 of the

- report, and within established environmental and planning policies;
- (b) new Park & Ride locations 1, 2 and 3, as set out in Figure 3 of the report, and also Scotland Farm, via comparison.
- (4) Requests officers to:
- (a) Ensure designs for the Western Orbital bus route, the bus route through North West Cambridge to the Science Park, and the management of buses in the city centre fully integrate with this project.
 - (b) Seek to deliver all these schemes as close in time as possible to the eastern section of the A428 Cambridge to Cambourne scheme.
- (5) Delegates to Cambridgeshire County Council's Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment:
- (a) Authority to act on input from the A428/A1303 Local Liaison Forum, the Parish Councils and Residents' Associations along Catchment Areas 3a and 4, interested members of the Joint Assembly and interested Councillors from the County, City and District Councils, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the City Deal Executive Board.
 - (b) Responsibility to:
 - (i) Identify specific route alignments within Catchment Area 3a and 4.
 - (ii) Identify a Park and Ride location.
 - (iii) Bring back the result of (i) and (ii) to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board for approval prior to release for public consultation.
 - (iv) Undertake a public consultation on those specific route alignments and Park & Ride locations, planned for May to July 2017.
 - (v) Subsequent to the above consultation, provide a report to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board, targeted for November 2017, containing a recommendation and Full Outline Business Case for a specific route alignment and one Park & Ride location that would then subsequently be developed in detail and an application made for Statutory Approval in 2018.

9. INDEPENDENT ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT PANEL UPDATE

The Joint Assembly considered a report which provided Members with an update on the procurement of the Independent Economic Assessment Panel, which would undertake the gateway review to which future City Deal tranches were subject. The report also set out relevant background detail regarding the Panel, the gateway review process and the link between these and infrastructure scheme prioritisation.

It was noted that the 2019 gateway review was expected to involve evaluation of the following:

- (a) delivery of prioritised schemes on track and on budget, according to their full business cases;
- (b) realisation of benefits forecast for those schemes that had been delivered in time to measure this, according to their full business cases;
- (c) wider economic impacts.

Councillor Tim Bick made the point that even if schemes were on target it would be difficult to properly assess (a) and (b) above as part of the 2019 review for those schemes in tranche 1 of the City Deal programme. Tanya Sheridan acknowledged this point and said that a realistic assessment would need to be undertaken by the Panel to reflect this, with the issues referred to in (a) and (b) likely to be fully assessed as part of the 2024 review. For tranche 1 she expected the key issue to be whether schemes were being delivered on track and on budget in accordance with their final business cases, adding that the Panel's review would provide useful information to help assess which schemes would best contribute to economic growth.

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

- (1) Notes the overview of the gateway review process for future tranches of funding.
- (2) Notes the progress on the procurement of the Independent Panel on the evaluation of local growth interventions.
- (3) Endorses the preferred tenderer status.
- (4) Notes the links between the Economic Assessment Panel and the prioritisation of City Deal infrastructure investments.

10. CITY DEAL FINANCIAL MONITORING

Consideration was given to a report which provided the Joint Assembly with the financial monitoring position for the period ending 31 August 2016.

Sarah Heywood, Head of Finance and Performance at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report and took Members through the summary of expenditure against the profiled budget up to the end of August 2016.

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

11. CITY DEAL STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER

The Joint Assembly considered a report which provided the Joint Assembly with an update on the City Deal Strategic Risk Register.

Aaron Blowers, City Deal Project Manager, presented the report and highlighted that it contained the latest information regarding the City Deal's Strategic Risk Register, including mitigating actions and control measures in place.

Helen Valentine referred to the Risk Register as appended to the report and asked a generic question as to whether the scores felt right. Focusing on risk number four, regarding stakeholder engagement, she questioned whether the likelihood and impact scores under the inherent risk and residual risk were at the correct level. She saw this particular issue, primarily the significant opposition to some schemes, being one of the largest reputational risks to the City Deal programme and made the point that this should be reflected in the Risk Register.

Tanya Sheridan acknowledged that this was a good challenge in terms of assessing what the City Deal was doing to more effectively promote the City Deal's strategic vision.

Councillor Kevin Price agreed with Helen Valentine's point but said that the appointment of the Strategic Communications Manager had significantly addressed an initial problem with public perception and a lack of understanding, accepting however that further work was necessary to improve communication of the City Deal's wider strategy.

Officers agreed to give further consideration to the impact and likelihood of the inherent and residual risks associated with risk number four.

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the position in regard to the Strategic Risk Register.

The Meeting ended at 7.19 p.m.
