



GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL JOINT ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly held on
Wednesday, 7 October 2015 at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Members of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly:

Councillor Tim Bick	Cambridge City Council (Chairman)
Councillor Roger Hickford	Cambridgeshire County Council (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Dave Baigent	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Kevin Price	Cambridge City Council
Councillor Noel Kavanagh	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Maurice Leeke	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Francis Burkitt	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

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

Councillor Ian Bates	Cambridgeshire County Council
----------------------	-------------------------------

Officers/advisors:

Liz Bisset	Cambridge City Council
Alan Carter	Cambridge City Council
Andrew Limb	Cambridge City Council
Graham Hughes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Chris Malyon	Cambridgeshire County Council
Brian Stinton	Cambridgeshire County Council
Stuart Walmsley	Cambridgeshire County Council
Aaron Blowers	City Deal Partnership
Tanya Sheridan	City Deal Partnership
Dan Clarke	Connecting Cambridgeshire
Adrian Cannard	Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership
Graham Watts	South Cambridgeshire District Council

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Anne Constantine (Cambridge Regional College) and Councillor Tim Wotherspoon (South Cambridgeshire District Council).

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman, reported that he had received a letter from Jane Ramsey of Cambridge University Hospitals giving notice of her resignation from the Joint Assembly due to work commitments. The Assembly asked the Chairman to write and thank Mrs Ramsey for her valuable contributions. It was noted that a nomination from the University

of Cambridge would be sought to fill this vacant position on the Joint Assembly.

Councillor Bick took this opportunity to introduce Tanya Sheridan to the Board, who had this week taken up her role as the City Deal Partnership Director.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 16 September 2015 were confirmed as a correct record, subject to the word 'transport' being replaced with the word 'traffic' in resolution (a) of minute number 7.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman, provided Joint Assembly Members with an update on the outcome of the Assembly's recommendations following consideration by the Executive Board on 1 October 2015, as follows:

- the Board had welcomed the Assembly's intention to conduct an investigation into the leading models of traffic management to reduce congestion in the city, calling for evidence from experts and advocates of the different models. It proposed that this 'call for evidence' be undertaken jointly by the Board and Assembly and that the City Deal Director and officers would produce an outline for the arrangement. The Chairman of the Board had suggested that the chairing and organisation of the sessions would be shared between the Board and Assembly, with all Members of both bodies invited. A report on the findings would be prepared subsequently by officers and circulated via the Assembly to the Board, leading to wider public consultation;
- the Board had agreed that improvements to Junction 11 of the M11 would be investigated further as an urgent standalone project with Highways England, in terms of initially assessing a business case;
- the legislation requiring changes to facilitate the City Deal moving towards a Combined Authority had been included as part of the Cities and Local Government Devolution Bill. At the last meeting of the Assembly it was agreed that the Chairman should write to local Members of Parliament to seek their support in progressing consideration of this issue, which the Assembly understood had been postponed by Parliament. It was agreed, in view of this issue now forming part of the Cities and Local Government Devolution Bill, that the letter would no longer be necessary.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

4. QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Questions asked, together with any responses from Members of the Joint Assembly or officers, were noted as follows:

Question by Heike Sowa

Mrs Sowa said that one focus of the City Deal was reducing congestion on the A1307 corridor between Haverhill and Cambridge. She said that Railfuture had analysed the 2011 census travel to work data which showed that the majority of people heading along this corridor worked in Cambridge and the cluster of Science Parks to the South-East of Cambridge. Although some road-based improvements were proposed, she felt that it was the reinstatement of the railway which would provide the long-term and high quality

permanent solution to the problem.

Mrs Sowa claimed that the population of Haverhill was predicted to reach 50,000 in the medium future and the reinstated railway would soon be thriving as it served not just Haverhill but all the main employment centres in Cambridge and South-East Cambridge. She said that the trackbed of the railway was largely unobstructed, making the re-opening relatively straightforward, and added that there was a large amount of support for the scheme.

She acknowledged that this proposal was beyond the individual funding levels provided by tranche one of the City Deal, but was of the opinion that the City Deal could help the scheme happen. She asked for the City Deal to fund a feasibility study to establish the prospects for rail on this corridor and enable a long-term plan to be developed.

Graham Hughes, Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment at Cambridgeshire County Council, said that the work requested by Mrs Sowa was already in hand and was one of the aspects of the A1307 study that was scheduled to be submitted to the Executive Board for consideration next year. Mr Hughes wanted to manage expectations in relation to the outcomes of that report so made the point that a railway line would not be able to penetrate the centre of Haverhill, resulting in catchment limitations. Whether or not the scheme included a large catchment area would be a key part of determining the viability of including railway provision. This issue would be investigated as part of the study by the consultants, but officers were of the opinion at this stage that railway provision in this area did not immediately have the makings of a viable scheme.

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman, reiterated the point that the study requested as part of the question was already taking place, the outcomes of which would be reported to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in the New Year.

Question by Matthew Danish

Mr Danish spoke as a resident of Histon Road and cycled along the road into Cambridge everyday. He saw many other people cycling and his main concern was seeing them having to manoeuvre around parked cars that obstructed the road at frequent intervals, often in restricted areas. He said that the threats not only came from the moving traffic but also from the possibility of a car door being flung open suddenly. The designs shown in the draft options report seemed to take a step in a better direction by putting additional parking restrictions in place. Mr Danish asked what other steps could be taken to prevent illegal parking in the planned cycle lane.

Mr Hughes reminded Members of the Assembly that whatever restrictions were put in place relied upon motorists obeying them and enforcement. He said that authorities did try to enforce restrictions as much as possible, but this could not occur everywhere across the City everyday. Mr Hughes confirmed that, technically, double or single yellow lines could be placed in cycle lanes to make it clear that restrictions were in place. This had been generally successful in other areas as most people tended to obey these types of restrictions. He also said that if there were specific hotspots where problems with illegal parking in cycle lanes repeatedly occurred, traffic enforcement officers could be directed to those areas to enforce the restrictions which itself would act as a deterrent.

Question by Edward Leigh

Mr Leigh said that the Better City Deal campaign group had noted the Executive Board's approval to publicly examine the various ideas proposed for tackling congestion in the City. He was concerned about the inconsistency of conducting such a consultation in

parallel with consultations on specific schemes that were based on a belief that bus lanes were the best and most cost-effective way to get people out of cars. Mr Leigh said that transportation was a connected system and changes required a coherent and comprehensive plan, which had not yet been produced.

He added that Council officers and external consultants were churning out detailed assessment reports and proposals for public consultation, most of which were inter-dependent. In particular, he said what measures were most appropriate to get more people onto buses, trains and bicycles would depend crucially on what measures were adopted to mitigate congestion in the City. Mr Leigh felt that it would be a huge mistake to rush into building expensive infrastructure that had an expected life of at least 50 years and would change the landscape and City environment irreversibly.

Mr Leigh suggested that the Joint Assembly and Executive Board should acknowledge that the City Deal timetable was unrealistic for the transportation workstream and that a request should be made to the Government for a pause of 12 to 24 months, with the explicit aim of using that time and part of the £20 million instalment to:

- conduct a series of sessions across the region to explain the City Deal and invite the public to contribute constructive ideas;
- conclude consultations on congestion and traffic generators in the City;
- create the necessary joint-authority governance structures and staff-up sufficiently to deliver the City Deal effectively and efficiently;
- draw up and put out for consideration a coherent outline 15-year transport strategy for the region, and a comprehensive 5-year transport plan for the City Deal programme;
- put in place the 'smart cities' infrastructure needed to gather and analyse traffic and journey data, and to improve the quality and timeliness of information available to travellers;
- conduct research, studies and trials of traffic management, access controls and bus routing.

Mr Leigh asked if the Joint Assembly would make this recommendation to the Executive Board.

Mr Hughes explained that there was strong evidence from around the world in respect of making changes to urban environments which supported the need to both provide alternatives to the use of private vehicles and improve key strategic radial routes. He said that by doing one of these things without the other would simply not solve the congestion problems in Cambridge and added that the City Deal programme very clearly set out schemes which addressed both. Schemes such as the A428 and Western Orbital were cited as examples of those key routes that would be improved, together with provision that was being put in place to offer people alternative modes of transport to that of the private car. The programme also included a clear plan for liaising with local people and traffic generators in respect of the congestion issue in Cambridge, prior to moving to public consultation. He also reported that the Cambridge Access Study was currently ongoing, which monitored and managed traffic movements.

Mr Hughes said that the City Deal programme was very joined up and that it had to be delivered and managed in a way that accommodated the profile in which funding was being received by the Government. He added that even if all of the City Deal money was received at this stage, it would still not be possible to deliver everything at once.

Councillor Tim Bick asked whether Members should be worried about delivery over the period of the first tranche of funding. Mr Hughes reminded the Assembly that the Executive Board had allocated approximately £180 million of schemes with £100 million of City Deal funding available, with the balance coming from other funding such as developer contributions and additional external sources. He added that this over-profiling would account for the fact that this was a complex programme and, in reality, some schemes may be delayed or changed during the development stages. He was confident that £100 million of schemes from City Deal funding would be delivered, and was also confident that they would bring with them significant benefits, so did not feel that Members should be worried about delivery.

Mr Hughes added that a 15% to 20% reduction in traffic would be needed to improve congestion in Cambridge, which needed to be addressed by doing a number of things. This was exactly what the City Deal programme was working towards.

Councillor Francis Burkitt responded to the request to recommend that the City Deal be paused for 12 to 24 months. He said that almost everything asked for as part of the question by Mr Leigh was being done already, that consultations were beginning to take place and that the City Deal was really beginning to move forward, citing the Executive Board's Forward Plan as an example of what was coming up. He endorsed everything that Mr Hughes had said and felt that by asking the Government for a break would make things much worse.

The Joint Assembly did not agree with the request to make the recommendation to the Executive Board, but noted Mr Leigh's comments.

Question by Roxanne De Beaux

Ms De Beaux, in respect of the Histon Road scheme, stated that the Cambridge Cycling Campaign welcomed proposals to improve cycling along Histon Road, crucially separating people on bikes from motor traffic and from pedestrians. She added, however, that the limited space on Histon Road meant that this could not be an option along the full length. Ms De Beaux asked what additional studies would be undertaken to explore options for ways to reduce through-traffic along these roads, such that bus lanes would not be required whilst still allowing reliable bus journeys, reduced air pollution and safer walking and cycling routes.

In terms of the Milton Road scheme, Ms De Beaux was of the view that this proposal had started with the narrow focus of improving bus services without trying to understand and solve the root causes of the congestion problems in Cambridge. As such, it was mostly an assumption that the best solution for moving the most number of people with the fastest, most reliable journey times, and in the most sustainable way, was achieved by buses with bus lanes. The Campaign thought this was a rash approach and that more should be done to reduce the overall level of traffic so that all transportation options could be safe and viable. She added that, in the Campaign's opinion, the current proposals were just bus lanes with cycling provision tacked on.

The Campaign urged the Joint Assembly to recommend that these plans be pushed back to ensure a more comprehensive proposal could be made and that if this was not possible it should strongly encourage the 'do maximum' option to ensure that cycling facilities were not compromised as part of the scheme.

Ms De Beaux said that the Campaign had identified a number of ways the proposal could be improved and asked whether it would be possible to meet with the consultants to share the Campaign's views.

Mr Hughes, in responding to the comments regarding Histon Road, referred to a call for evidence that was being managed to engage with people to consider their ideas for addressing the congestion problems in Cambridge. He said that officers had always been clear that there would be a two-pronged approach to the transport infrastructure aspect of the City Deal, as set out in answer to Mr Leigh's question earlier, with regard to offering alternative modes of transportation and addressing key radial routes. He added that other specific measures were already in place, such as the Cambridge Access Study, which would continue to look at improved movement and traffic flow, particularly for the benefit of pedestrians, cyclists and buses.

In terms of Milton Road, Mr Hughes said that the Campaign's comments were understandably focussed on the perspective of cyclists, but officers had to balance the needs of all users. Officers were seeking to put forward something that supported vulnerable users, making them safe, but also allowing for other modes of transport. In terms of the radial routes, Mr Hughes made the point that many people used these as a way of getting into Cambridge where cycling simply was not an option for them. Mr Hughes made it clear, however, that there was a commitment to improve cycling as part of these schemes.

Mr Hughes said that, as with the A428 Madingley Road corridor scheme previously considered by the Assembly and Board, the schemes at Histon Road and Milton Road at this stage set out indicative options for the purpose of an initial consultation process. He expected a range of comments to be submitted as part of the consultation exercise and welcomed support or hybrids of the options contained within the documentation that would be published, together with any other options put forward as part of that process. Much more detailed proposals could then be developed around the views received which would be judged against the needs of all users.

Councillor Bridget Smith, in response to the request from the Cambridge Cycling Campaign to meet with the consultants to share their ideas, asked why this could not occur. Mr Hughes highlighted that a number of stakeholder meetings on both schemes had been held, which the Cycling Campaign was involved in, so assured the Assembly that these discussions had already taken place. He reiterated that all points of view from all user groups had to be taken into account when developing these schemes.

5. PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

6. REPORTS SCHEDULED TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL EXECUTIVE BOARD

6 (a) Histon Road bus priority walking and cycling measures: approval to consult

Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman, agreed to facilitate the consideration of this item and the following item at minute number 6(b) in respect of Milton Road as one debate.

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

Stuart Walmsley, Head of Major Infrastructure Development at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the two reports and reminded Members of the Assembly that these were well defined projects that had been within the County Council's long term Transport

Strategy for some time. It was well known that the two routes suffered from congestion and that bus times along the routes were unreliable, with delays very frequent at bus stops and junctions. City Deal schemes for the two routes provided an opportunity to look at them in a broader sense and consider a radical approach. The width and geometry of the two roads changed quite dramatically, but officers were confident that they could develop options to provide the best possible mixture of solutions to support all modes of transport.

Mr Walmsley emphasised that these schemes would seek to include innovative and real-time 'smart' infrastructure and that there would be opportunities to incorporate this along the entire length of both routes. He noted that there were issues from a public realm perspective, in terms of trees, grass verges and the environmental impact, all of which would be properly considered as part of the process moving forward. The purpose of this initial consultation for both schemes was to understand what was achievable and acceptable along those corridors. Subject to approval, consultation documentation was scheduled to be published in December 2015, with exhibitions to be held in January 2016.

Claire Ruskin proposed an amendment to recommendation (b) of both reports by adding the words 'and encourages all other ideas to be properly considered' at the end of the sentence to ensure that it was clear that all ideas would be given due consideration. The Joint Assembly unanimously supported this proposal.

In answer to a question as to whether there was any danger of options for these schemes being unaffordable, it was noted that all options would be properly costed for delivery with the funding available. Mr Walmsley highlighted that costs in relation to these two schemes would be high as a result of the anticipated complexities and issues that arose from working in urban areas, together with the technology and signals intended to be put in place. Provision would be made in the costings of each option for contingencies and risk mitigation.

Responding to questions regarding the consultants appointed to lead these projects, Mr Walmsley reported that they had been appointed through a tendering process, with quality and cost being key specifications. The chosen consultants had experience of working on similar projects and had demonstrated very good levels of engagement, leaving officers with no question that the right people had been appointed to lead these schemes. He added, by way of reassurance, that Greater Cambridge City Deal transport schemes were attracting interest from high-quality, international consultants.

It was suggested that an aspect missing from the report was an understanding of what people were using these corridors for in terms of where they were travelling to and from. Brian Stinton, Team Leader for Major Works from Cambridgeshire County Council, said that work was underway on traffic modelling to establish and identify the origin and destination of people using those routes.

It was noted that members of the public would appreciate specific dates in terms of when consultation processes were due to commence and when certain reports would be considered by the Joint Assembly and Executive Board. Mr Walmsley acknowledged this point and confirmed that consultation documentation should be available for publication on 15 December 2015, with exhibitions taking place in the middle of January 2016 and an update report being submitted to the Executive Board on 16 June 2016.

Discussion ensued on the loss of trees and vegetation, specifically in relation to Milton Road but also the scheme at Histon Road and urban transport infrastructure schemes in general. It was noted that Cambridge City Council, from a landscaping perspective, formed part of the stakeholder group and its expertise would be utilised to address this issue and help shape the project. Councillor Maurice Leeke referred to a number of

innovative measures that could be put in place to maintain or replace greenery or vegetation in such circumstances and suggested inviting an expert or consultant on landscaping to a future meeting of the Joint Assembly. This was unanimously supported.

During discussion it was agreed that further clarity needed to be provided in the documentation that would be published as part of the public consultation regarding the dotted lines in the maps relating to potential bus routes, explaining what these represented, together with a definition of each of the 'advisory', 'mandatory' and 'segregated' cycleway categories. It was also highlighted that cycling, as well as bus use, needed to be reflected as a priority as part of both projects.

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

- (a) Notes the findings from the initial assessment and technical study.
- (b) Approves public consultation on the illustrative measures as set out in the report and as shown on the accompanying plans, and encourages all other ideas to be properly considered.
- (c) Agrees to receive a report on consultation in late spring of 2016 on a preferred set of measures.

6 (b) Milton Road bus priority, walking and cycling measures: approval to consult

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

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

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

The Joint Assembly unanimously **AGREED** that an expert or consultant on landscaping should be invited to a future meeting to discuss innovative ways in which greenery and vegetation could be maintained or replaced amongst significant transport infrastructure schemes, and asked the Chairman and Vice-Chairman to add this to the Assembly's work programme.

6 (c) Smarter Cambridgeshire update and investment proposal

The Joint Assembly considered a report which provided an update on the progress of the Smarter Cambridgeshire workstream and outlined a proposal for the implementation of a 'smart' technology platform to facilitate the Smart Cities approach within the City Deal programme.

Andrew Limb, Head of Corporate Strategy at Cambridge City Council, presented the report and highlighted the following updates from the workstream:

- the Smarter Cambridgeshire Project Board, comprising officers representing the five participating organisations, had been established and was now overseeing the multiple strands of the Smarter Cambridgeshire work stream;
- the wider Smarter Cambridgeshire Advisory Group, with representation from both Universities and local technology companies, had met and further workshops were planned;
- a 'hack' event, to encourage wider community engagement in the Smart Cities agenda, had been provisionally planned for the end of October;
- work was progressing in support of a number of demonstrator test bed work packages, including:
 - a planning workshop for identifying the key components for a 'Smart A14';
 - outline agreement for station gateway way finding improvements;
 - enabling work packages to support the development of a dynamic journey planner;
- a collaborative joint bid was being developed for the 'Innovate UK Internet of Things' competition, which involved joint working with Milton Keynes and Leeds City Councils, with support BT and the involvement of several other commercial organisations.

In terms of the Smart City technology platform, it was reported that an outline proposal had now been developed for the implementation of a platform to support the delivery of the Smarter Cambridgeshire workstream within the City Deal programme. This comprised a city management network, a data hub and sensor deployment plan and was the result of work undertaken to create a smart architecture blueprint. Further details relating to the platform were set out in the report.

Mr Limb reported that the £280,000 of further investment being sought was to set up the foundations in order to allow the platform and related aspects of the workstream to develop further. He said that this was a relatively small investment in terms of the wider City Deal programme and the market being invested in, however, it would be enough to ensure that things started progressing. He reminded the Assembly that the workstream did not want to invest in the wrong technology in view of its high cost and ever-changing landscape, so it was key for the City Deal workstream to be in an agile position with regard to what it sought to invest in and implement.

Members welcomed the report, but asked that future reports made it clear what the funding would actually be used for, noting in this case that it would be for the procurement of necessary hardware and software.

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

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

6 (d) 2015/16 Quarter 2 financial monitoring report

The Joint Assembly considered a report which provided an update on the financial monitoring position for the City Deal for the period ending 30 September 2015.

Chris Malyon, Chief Finance Officer at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report and took Members of the Assembly through the City Deal programme costs incurred to the end of September 2015, together with revenue and the non-project resource pool.

Assembly Members noted that there was still approximately £2.2 million of funding unallocated within the non-project resources pool, which was made up of New Homes Bonus contributions from the three partner Councils. It was reported, however, that the future of the New Homes Bonus was unclear ahead of the Comprehensive Spending Review. It was anticipated that more clarity would be provided as part of the Autumn Statement, with any decision as to how this non-project resources pool would be used being at the discretion of the Executive Board.

A question was raised as to whether partner Councils would be able to retain their New Homes Bonus contributions if there was any underspend and the resource remained unallocated. It was noted that this decision would also be at the discretion of the Board.

A request was made for further financial reports to reflect the additional funding that could be available for schemes within the programme, such as from developer contributions for example. It was noted that this information would be included in the comprehensive financial report scheduled to be submitted to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in the New Year as part of the 2016/17 City Deal budget.

The Joint Assembly **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board notes the report.

6 (e) Six-monthly report on housing

The Joint Assembly considered a report which provided an update on progress with the Housing workstream.

Alan Carter, Head of Strategic Housing at Cambridge City Council, presented the report which outlined governance around the Housing Development Agency that had been established, together with information on schemes and anticipated numbers of new housing.

A supplementary report was also considered, setting out the latest developments with regard to affordable housing in light of radically changing national housing, planning and welfare policy. It was reported that the requirement for registered providers and stock retaining local authorities to reduce rents by 1% per annum each year for four years was in the Welfare Reform and Work Bill going through Parliament, with a view for the rent reductions to be implemented from April 2016. Other government proposals, such as the extension of the Right to Buy to tenants of housing associations funded by the sale of high value Council housing, would either be introduced by Regulation or in a Housing Bill scheduled to be published in October 2015.

Mr Carter explained that the consequence for Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council was dramatic, with significant projected losses for both authorities from their long term housing business plans.

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

Liz Bissett, Director of Customer and Community Services at Cambridge City Council, said that the City Deal's housing workstream still had a significant programme that could be developed and delivered over the medium term.

A comment was expressed that there was not enough information contained within the report, in view of the fact that it was a six-monthly update. It was agreed that future update reports on this workstream would be more comprehensive.

The Joint Assembly **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board notes the report.

7. **GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL FORWARD PLAN**

The Joint Assembly considered the City Deal forward plan and its schedule of meetings.

It was noted that the item on the A1307 corridor had moved from the December cycle of meetings to the January 2016 cycle of meetings.

The Joint Assembly **NOTED** the City Deal forward plan and its schedule of meetings.

The Meeting ended at 4.15 p.m.
