



**GREATER
CAMBRIDGE
CITY DEAL**

Securing future prosperity

GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL JOINT ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly held on
Wednesday, 18 January 2017 at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly:

Councillor Roger Hickford	Cambridgeshire County Council (Chairman)
Councillor Kevin Price	Cambridge City Council (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Tim Bick	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Noel Kavanagh	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Maurice Leeke	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Kevin Cuffley	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Bridget Smith	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillor Tim Wotherspoon	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Sir Michael Marshall	Marshall Group
Claire Ruskin	Cambridge Network
Andy Williams	AstraZeneca
Dr John Wells	Cancer Research UK Cambridge Institute

Officers/advisors:

Hilary Holden	City Deal Partnership
Bob Menzies	Cambridgeshire County Council
Tanya Sheridan	City Deal Partnership
Victoria Wallace	South Cambridgeshire District Council

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Mark Robertson, Helen Valentine and Councillor David Baigent.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 1 December 2016 were agreed as a correct record, subject to the following amendment:

- Agenda Item 8 M11 Junction 11: Bus only slip roads:
 - 'AstraZeneca already had 2000 employees located on the site...' would be amended to 'AstraZeneca would have 2000 employees located at the site'.

4. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

The Chairman reported that a significant number of questions had been submitted by members of the public. Questions that did not relate to an item on the agenda but had been ruled in by the Chair would be taken under agenda item 4 with others being

addressed at the relevant agenda item. Due to there being multiple questions which related to the same issues, the Chairman decided that questions would be grouped by issue and a collective response given for each group of questions. He expressed regret that due to the volume of questions, speakers whose questions had been grouped were requested to ask their questions in one minute each just for this meeting.

The following questions by Carolyn Postgate, Alistair Burford, Stephen Coates and Chris Pratten were grouped together:

Question by Carolyn Postgate

At the Joint Assembly meeting on 29 September 2016, you committed to making a decision on your preferred Park & Ride locations, 1, 2, 3 and Scotland Farm. You asked the officers to produce a side-by-side analysis of the sites so that you could make an informed decision. My questions are:

- a. When Andy Williams of AstraZeneca asked for a simple side-by-side analysis, why did the officers not disclose to the Assembly the Atkins Report on Park & Ride locations dated September 2015?
- b. Has the Assembly had sight of the Atkins Report before now?
- c. Given the strength of feeling against site 3 on 29 September, does the Assembly have the courage to recommend that site 3 should be excluded from further consideration?

Question by Alistair Burford

- a. Given that the officers state that the Atkins report 'informed the consultation' that was carried out in late 2015, why was site 3, Crome Lea Farm not disclosed as part of the public consultation?
- b. Does the Assembly think that if the Crome Lea had been clearly identified at the public consultation that the objections to the site would have been far greater?
- c. I have concerns about the report that was sent to me. I have made further Freedom of Information requests in an attempt to retrieve the original version and the revised version of the report, but my requests have not been successful. Could officers explain why the reports have been withheld?
- d. As the consultation excluded some vital information about the location of site three, does the Assembly agree that the consultation conducted in November 2015 was flawed and failed to meet the principles of a fair and transparent consultation?

Question by Stephen Coates

Mr Coates expressed disagreement with a time limit of one minute to ask a question, stating that this limited the community's right to speak. The Chairman pointed out that he had used Chairman's discretion to allow public questions which did not relate to items on the Joint Assembly meeting's agenda, but on reflection thought it might be best to focus on questions related directly to the agenda for future meetings. The Chairman pointed out that he tried to be inclusive and assured Mr Coates that a written answer would be provided to the question he had submitted in advance of the meeting.

Question by Rita Lang on behalf of Chris Pratten

Will the Assembly recommend that officers be asked to immediately produce and publish a list of all documents and reports produced by Atkins and other consultants regarding the Cambourne to Cambridge transport corridor.

In response to these questions, Bob Menzies (Cambridgeshire County Council) explained that the Autumn 2015 consultation had been carried out on the concept of a Park and Ride site at or near the Madingley Mulch roundabout, rather than on specific sites for it. The Atkins report would be made available on the City Deal website; its purpose was to assess

the feasibility of providing Park and Ride Capacity at or near Madingley Mulch roundabout. The Chairman stated that Mr Burford would receive a written answer to his question.

The following questions by Allan Treacy, Amanda Fuller and Roger Tomlinson were grouped together:

Question by Allan Treacy

With the topographical study on the Madingley Rise onroad busway option having been completed, why has the feasibility study not yet been completed and by what date will it be available?

Question by Amanda Fuller

Given that Option 3/3A for the West Cambridge busway was opposed by the majority of people in the consultation, given that the economic case for this option has more holes in it than a crocheted blanket, given that this option will be hugely environmentally destructive, given that this option represents very poor value for money and given that a Park & Ride on Madingley Hill can only be described as a blot on the landscape, does the Joint Assembly endorse the Executive Board's decision to choose this as the preferred option over the more cost effective and environmentally sensitive on-road scheme proposed by the Local Liaison Forum?

Question by Roger Tomlinson

Can the Joint Assembly members confirm that they have read the "Strategic Economic Appraisal" and understood it? Assuming the answer is yes, what is their view of them being supplied seriously misleading and inaccurate and incomplete information? And what action do they propose in relation to the officers who supplied it? Will the Joint Assembly insist that officers go back and re-develop the economic case on the correct basis?

In response to these questions, Bob Menzies explained that the Executive Board on 13 October 2016 had asked officers to assess the possibility of a two way busway and two car lanes on the A1303 Madingley Rise, as suggested by members of the Local Liaison Forum. The topographical study had been completed and the feasibility study was being undertaken to assess whether this was possible and its impacts. The Board had also asked officers to work up route options for a segregated bus-only road, which would come back to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in July 2017.

The Chairman stated that a written answer would be provided to Mr Treacey's question. He then explained that Antony Carpen's question had been ruled in as it related to communications, an item that was not on the forward agenda for the Joint Assembly.

Question by Antony Carpen

Please can members, in particular the representatives from Cambridge Regional College and Anglia Ruskin University, update the Assembly on what actions they've taken to ensure they are systematically engaging with and getting ideas from young people - in particular in the run up to tranche two of funding.

The City Deal Programme Director responded to this question, thanking members of the public who had submitted responses to the City Deal's communications review. She explained that the use of social media by the City Deal had increased with the intention of reaching younger people, however it was recognised that more could be done. She had met with Anglia Ruskin (ARU) and Cambridge Regional College (CRC), both of whom were engaging with their students' unions on the City Deal and intended to continue to do so. Cycling was of most interest to ARU and apprenticeships to some CRC students. The Joint Assembly Chairman also responded by reminding Mr Carpen that he had trialled starting Joint Assembly meetings at 4pm rather than 2pm so that more members of the

public might be able to attend more readily, but that had not had the effect that had been hoped.

Assurance was sought from the Chairman that when written answers were circulated to members of the public, that these would also be circulated to Joint Assembly members. The Chairman confirmed that as this was usual practice, Joint Assembly members would receive the written answers.

5. PETITIONS

Petitions were presented on the proposals for Peak Congestion Control Points that had formed part of the Cambridge access consultation by Stop Cambridge Road Closures and Keep Cambridge Open for Business. These were to be considered further under agenda item 7, where the Cambridge Access proposals would be discussed. The Chairman decided that Patrick von Heimendahl's question on small business representation, asked when he presented the latter petition, should receive a written answer.

The Joint Assembly also received and noted a petition from the North Newnham Residents Association against Adams Road as part of the proposed Cambourne to Cambridge bus route. The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the petition and that it would consider a further report on the Cambourne to Cambridge proposals in July 2017.

6. FORWARD PLAN

Question from Robin Heydon

We are concerned that the forward plan shows a March agenda item for the City Deal design guide but we have not seen any consultation on this document or any process for commenting on it. Could you inform the public how they should comment on this document such that the comments can be considered before the March meetings.

The City Deal Programme Director explained that there had not been a public consultation as the Environmental Design Guidance just captured existing key local policies and guidance, rather than setting any new ones. She assured Mr Heydon that reference would be made to the Department for Transport guidance on cycle infrastructure.

The City Deal Programme Director presented the City Deal Forward Plan, which the Joint Assembly **NOTED**.

7. CITY ACCESS CONGESTION REDUCTION PROPOSALS: CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND NEXT STEPS

Hilary Holden (City Access Programme) presented the report which set out the results from the consultation on Tackling Peak-Time Congestion in Cambridge, which were informing the work of the City Access project team and influencing the emerging work programme. The purpose of the report was to agree next steps on the city access work following the consultation, in line with the project objectives and scope agreed in January and June 2016.

The following public questions were addressed under this agenda item:

Question from Dr Joanna Gomula

Dr Gomula was not present at the meeting.

Question from Cathy Mitchell

Ms Mitchell was not present at the meeting.

Question from Aylmer Johnson

It is encouraging to see that the Council's City Deal includes plans for orbital bus routes, which will greatly improve the city's public transport network. However the main benefit will only be realised if the existing radial routes are made straighter and if 'oyster' cards are introduced to allow all passengers to change buses easily.

In response to this question, Mr Johnson was informed that:

- The City Deal Executive Board had considered options for further investment in smart technologies in July 2016 and work to look at barriers to integrated ticket purchasing had been commissioned. An initial report was expected in February 2017.
- Improving bus and cycling infrastructure on radial routes was a key part of the overall transport programme and part of the proposed delivery plan for better buses.

Question from Robin Pellew on behalf of Cambridge Past, Present and Future

Will the City Deal Assembly recommend that the Executive Board should instruct officers to work up the measures in the proposed Access and Congestion package as proposed in agenda item 7, whilst at the same time ask the Board to elaborate what this pollution charge comprises and how it would be applied?

In response to this question, Mr Pellew was informed that:

- Officers were recommending that physical demand measures be looked at further, with work continuing on this.
- A congestion charge was not being recommended as a priority, given question marks around its deliverability.
- It was pointed out that there was no congestion charge in any city outside London.
- A pollution charge also had a deliverability risk and required the sign off of the Secretary of State for Transport. It was highlighted that a pollution charge was not the only way to deliver a clean air zone. The report recommended work on the feasibility of a clean air zone, in the light of consultation feedback that tackling congestion also provided an opportunity to address air quality issues.

Question from Robin Heydon

Doesn't the Hills Road cycle scheme prove that when high quality cycling facilities are provided that they will be used? When will the City Deal extend these benefits to other main roads, and reallocate road space on other main roads for people walking and cycling?

In response to his question, Mr Heydon was informed that:

- These benefits would be sought to be extended to other main roads as soon as possible, as it was recognised that there was a clear link between the facilities provided and an increase in people cycling.
- The City Deal would continue with its ambition to continue to improve cycling infrastructure.

Question by Michael Paige asked on behalf of Lynn Hieatt

In advance of any County proposals, will the City Deal Assembly today unambiguously support the principle of (1) a city-wide solution to what is now an uncontrolled parking free-for-all; (2) a scheme designed in partnership with residents and businesses, allowing local flexibility and experiment, so that neighbourhoods can get the system that works for them and supports the City Deal's objective of controlling congestion?

In response to the question, the following points were made:

- On street parking controls were Cambridgeshire County Council's jurisdiction. The City Deal's role was a supporting role.
- On street parking controls complemented the workplace parking levy.

Following the public questions, the Joint Assembly debated the recommendations.

Congestion charging was debated. The following points were made:

- Councillor Bick thought the public should be given the chance to have their say on congestion charging with an illustration of how it could work.
- The Vice Chairman argued that the only place in the country with a congestion charge was London. He expressed concern that the introduction of a congestion charge in Cambridge would be unfair, leading to only the most well off being able to afford to drive whilst those on lower incomes would be left choosing between poor public transport and high costs to drive to work.
- Cllr Smith argued that unlike big infrastructure projects such as busways and park and ride sites, a congestion charge could be reversible, flexible and adaptable so it could be trialled and implemented at different times of day. It was felt that the City Deal should consult on these options and people could be given the choice between a congestion charge and large infrastructure projects. She added and Cllr Maurice Leake also argued that a congestion charge would generate income, which would subsidise a better public transport system. Cllr Leake thought that those who could afford to drive in would, while those who could not would benefit from subsidised public transport.
- If a congestion charge was introduced, concern was raised regarding whether groups who provided services such as carers, district nurses and taxi firms for example, would have to pay the charge. Cllr Cuffley stated that he opposed a congestion charge until significantly improved infrastructure and public transport were in place.
- Cllr Kavanagh recalled that Edinburgh and Manchester had decided not to proceed with congestion charging. He thought the costs and investment in the equipment needed to collect and enforce a congestion charge would outweigh the income received and that the congestion charge would need to be raised to be effective, as was the case in London.
- Claire Ruskin made a plea for 2017 to be 'the year of evidence'. She suggested a change to the recommendation to require officers to assess data and evidence and look at measures to increase access and reduce congestion. Andy Williams agreed that there was a need for good analysis and for ongoing engagement with the public. John Wells stated that modal shift needed either an economic or a physical incentive or signal and wanted to see more numerical information on the impact of doing nothing and on what was needed to achieve objectives.

A vote was taken on congestion charging and other fiscal demand management being investigated further with six members voting in favour of this and six members against.

The workplace parking levy was discussed and debated, with the following points made:

- Further information was provided by officers regarding income that was projected from congestion charging and the workplace parking levy. The Joint Assembly was informed that it was estimated that the workplace parking levy (WPL) could generate £7-11 million and congestion charging could potentially generate £40 million.
- Sir Michael Marshall declared an interest in the work place levy, as Marshall Group would be affected by the proposals as currently set out. He thought that the

workplace parking levy would be seen as another tax and that it would not achieve any tangible benefits. He also worried that it would create burdens for employers needing to administer it, that the impact of the workplace parking levy would fall largely on the outskirts of the city and that the impact would be felt by employers rather than employees.

- Officers were asked by Cllr Bick what evidence they had of the Government's willingness to approve a workplace parking levy scheme. The City Deal Programme Director replied that officers would be meeting with the Department of Transport to follow up if the Board agreed to the proposed further work on a Workplace Parking Levy.
- Officers were asked what the offer was to employers on the edge of the city regarding the workplace parking levy. In response to this, the Joint Assembly was informed that should the Board agree to continue to work on a workplace levy, officers and the Local Enterprise Partnership would work with business on the potential offer to employers.
- Officers were asked by Cllr Smith asked about revenue generation, running costs, governance and enforcement of the workplace parking levy. In response to this, the Joint Assembly was informed that:
 - The WPL would be an efficient form of revenue generation, with the proportion of reinvestment of revenue higher than with a congestion charging scheme.
 - Employers would have to apply for a licence and organisations would have to declare the number of parking spaces they had.
 - Enforcement would be through spot checks. Further work was needed on where the responsibility for enforcement lay. The example of Nottingham was given, where responsibility for this was a City Council function.
- Cllr Leake argued what the funds raised from a workplace parking levy would be used for needed to be defined very specifically. It was felt that these should be ring fenced for public transport improvements. Reassurance was sought that this be defined in the next part of the process. He expressed concern that imposing a workplace parking levy would be a less efficient way than a congestion charge of achieving modal shift, which was needed in order to reduce congestion.
- A paper which assessed the impact of the introduction of a workplace parking levy in Nottingham would be circulated to Joint Assembly members.
- It was felt that the purpose of the introduction of a levy would be to protect the city centre. Therefore businesses in the city centre with fewer than ten parking spaces should not be exempt from the levy.
- A request was made that exclusion from the workplace parking levy should not be based on number of spaces held by a business, but on the revenue of the company.
- Claire Ruskin said it was important to consider the incomes of those impacted.

On street parking controls were debated, with the following points made:

- Cllr Cuffley wanted further data analysis of movement and parking within Cambridge City was needed. He wanted to understand why retail traffic information, including how long people were parking in spaces, was not included in data assessments. In response to this, the Joint Assembly was informed that this level of detail had not been captured in a survey of 12,000 parking spaces, which had provided a snapshot of activity.
- Cllr Kavanagh felt that restricting parking in Cambridge would lead to a modal shift, thereby reducing the number of cars in Cambridge.
- Cllr Hickford expressed concern that until other options for people to use were in place such as better public transport, that the implementation of parking controls would disperse many vehicles further out of the city rather than reduce the number

of vehicles. The impact on people in South and East Cambridgeshire of changes to parking controls needed to be considered.

- Modal shift was needed in order to reduce the number of vehicles in the city but until other mitigating alternatives were in place to facilitate this, on street parking controls should not be implemented. Officers responded to this, informing the Joint Assembly that over time, other options would be in place and that if residential parking were to be introduced, it would be implemented by area and not across the whole city at once.
- Officers were asked what the timescale for the first residents' (or controlled) parking zones was. In response to this the Joint Assembly was informed that, under the existing policy and the proposed new policy, it would be for an area to request residents' parking rather than it being imposed them. Once a parking zone was requested there would be a public consultation before implementation. The Joint Assembly was informed that where requested, parking zones could be set up within 12 months.
- Cllr Smith felt that new residents' parking zones failed the test of fairness for low-paid workers and students.
- Concern was raised that by the City Deal funding a consultation on new resident parking zones, it would be held to account on something about which was the responsibility of the county Council, advised by the Cambridge Joint Area Committee.
- Cllr Bick expressed support for work to improve air quality, such as the proposed work on a clean air zone. He wanted to know what impact it would have on congestion and how easily it could be implemented. The Joint Assembly was informed that a Clean Air Zone would need Government agreement.
- Claire Ruskin felt that smart technology should be higher up on the list and integral to the strategy; it must not be an afterthought.
- Encouraging more people to car share was suggested by Cllr Kavanagh.
- The Joint Assembly highlighted the importance of bearing in mind the people who would be impacted if changes were not made and agreed an amendment to the recommendations to that effect.

The Joint Assembly was keen to see more evidence and data on the impact of 'do nothing' and what was needed to achieve the headline objectives and vision for Cambridge Access. Officers explained that the vision was to reduce traffic volume in Cambridge by 10-15%, based on 2011 levels. Officers would assess existing data by July 2017. Bob Menzies offered to arrange a briefing session on the transport evidence base.

Following debate, amendments were proposed to recommendation (a)(i). It was proposed that the word 'physical' be removed from the recommendation. The proposed amended recommendation was that 'Officers should work up and assess options for a package of demand measures'. This was so that other, for example fiscal, measures such as congestion charging should be considered.

A vote was taken on this proposed amendment with six votes in favour and six against the proposed amendment.

It was proposed that recommendation (a)(i) be replaced with 'Officers should assess existing data and evidence of desired access between destinations to create an overview of measures that will increase access while reducing congestion'. This was discussed with Joint Assembly members indicating their support for the inclusion of this recommendation, in addition to the existing recommendations. This recommendation was therefore added as (a)(ii).

Regarding recommendation (b)(vii), following discussion the Joint Assembly agreed that an emphasis on smart technology going forward be included in this recommendation.

Regarding recommendation (c)(iv), concern was expressed for those who would be impacted if changes were not made and the Joint Assembly agreed that this should be added to the recommendation.

Regarding recommendation (d), following discussion the Joint Assembly agreed that data analysis and joined up strategy should be included in the proposed plans listed.

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

a) Agrees that :

- i. Officers should work up and assess options for a package of physical demand management measures.
- ii. Officers should assess existing data and evidence of desired access between destinations to create an overview of measures that will increase access while reducing congestion.
- iii. Physical demand measures should make the best use of the limited road space and capacity in Cambridge, in order to improve bus reliability, cycling and walking, particularly within the designated Air Quality Management Area.
- iv. No further work is undertaken on the package of six peak-time congestion control points consulted upon.

b) Agrees that officers should continue to work up and assess options for the other seven elements of the eight-point plan consulted on, including:

- i. A Workplace Parking Levy: Co-design a workplace parking levy (WPL) scheme with employers with more detail available for Board and public review later in 2017:
 1. To work with individual employers and groups of employers during 2017 on the details of the scheme.
 2. To determine the local transport priorities that will receive the revenue raised, building on employer evidence of transport needs and coordinated with Council infrastructure planners.
 3. To be coordinated with and if feasible form a part of the City Deal and the Local Enterprise Partnership's broader engagement with the business community.
 4. The roll-out to include practical support for employers looking to manage their parking demand in advance of the levy coming into effect.
 5. It is recommended that as far as possible, the Cambridge WPL should resemble the Nottingham template. However, there will need to be agreement on how to charge, the price, its geographical extent, exemptions and how it will be administered and enforced.
- ii. On-Street Parking Controls: Note that the Cambridge City Joint Area Committee (CJAC) is considering whether to recommend changes to parking policy in Cambridge and subject to business case, the City Deal would fund consultation on new residents' parking zones and the costs of implementation. Although the Assembly **NOTED** this potential action, it **DID NOT SUPPORT IT**. The Assembly considered this should not go ahead until there was mitigating alternatives in place to counter the potential

displacement of vehicles.

- iii. Improved Public Space and Air Quality: Agrees that officers should:
 - 1. Assess the possibility of establishing a Clean Air Zone and the potential for the introduction of a pollution charge in central Cambridge within the existing Air Quality Management Area. Key criteria for assessing this should be its impacts on: health; the local environment, including air quality and public realm; bus reliability and cycling; business and the economy; deliverability and value for money.
 - 2. Ensure that initiatives to improve city centre access should continue to consider opportunities for improving the city centre experience and economy and that this should be coordinated with other work across the Partnership that has similar objectives, including planning policy.
 - iv. Better Bus Services and Expanded Park & Ride: Agrees that officers should continue work to identify how to reduce bus delays on key bus routes by engaging bus operators and finalising the Bus Network Review.
 - v. Better Pedestrian and Cycling Infrastructure: Agrees that officers should continue to work with other partners to improve cycling and pedestrian infrastructure.
 - vi. Travel Planning: Agrees that officers should continue to work with Travel for Cambridgeshire to support employers to adopt sustainable policies and practices with regard to travel to work and travel during work.
 - vii. Smart Technology: Agrees that officers should continue to work with Connecting Cambridgeshire to develop smart technology solutions, and that there is more emphasis placed on Smart Technology by the Greater Cambridge City Deal going forward.
- c) Agrees that officers, with partner assistance, should delivery a City Access communication and engagement plan to support these recommendations if agreed. It is recommended that the plan focusses on communicating:
- i. Factual information about the vision for the future;
 - ii. Statistics and research results;
 - iii. The need for a package of complementary measures to ensure productivity growth without commensurate growth in congestion;
 - iv. How we are developing workable solutions by designing them in partnership with those who will be impacted *and those impacted if changes are not made*;
 - v. The plan will also set out how the City Access programme fits into the broader plan for city centre revitalisation, and the wider City Deal transport vision and housing plan.
- d) To take these recommendations forward, it is proposed that work on the individual elements of the City Centre access work be developed through a series of delivery plans. Proposed plans are:
- i. *Data analysis and joined up strategy*
 - ii. Bus improvement delivery plan
 - iii. Communications and engagement delivery plan

- iv. Cycling provision delivery plan
- v. Demand management delivery plan
- vi. Parking management delivery plan including a workplace parking levy and on-street parking controls
- vii. Public space and air quality delivery plan including pedestrian infrastructure
- viii. Smart technology delivery plan
- ix. Travel planning delivery plan

8. CHANGE CONTROL AND ISSUE MANAGEMENT

The City Deal Programme Director presented the report which set out the approach to change control and issue management across the City Deal programme.

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

- a) Notes and endorses the codification of the principles used in the City Deal for change control and issue management.
- b) Agrees the proposed approach for reporting issues and change control.

9. PROGRESS REPORT

The City Deal Programme Director presented the City Deal progress report.

Councillor Susan van de Ven was invited to speak in relation to this item. Councillor van de Ven informed the Joint Assembly that in relation to the Cambridge to Royston cycle scheme, the Local Enterprise Partnership Board supported multi-agency funding of the route to complete the scheme from Melbourn to Royston. Councillor van de Ven was bringing this to the Joint Assembly's attention as the Executive Board would be asked to join the Local Enterprise Partnership to fund the Melbourn to Royston link, at its meeting on 25 January 2017.

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the City Deal progress report and Councillor van de Ven's update.

10. FINANCE MONITORING

Consideration was given to the Greater Cambridge City Deal's financial monitoring position for the period ending 31 December 2016. The Finance Director's delegated powers had been used to authorise costs of procuring the services of an Interim Chief Executive. Cllr Bick stated that he disagreed with the way the procurement of the Interim Chief Executive had been handled; he felt that it had been known about before the last Joint Assembly meeting and the Joint Assembly should have been made aware earlier.

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the financial position for the period ending 31 December 2016.

11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The date of the next meeting, to be held on 1 March 2016 at 2pm, was noted.

The Meeting ended at 5.18 p.m.
