



**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, 1 December 2016 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 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

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

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

Officers/advisors:

Ashley Heller	Cambridgeshire County Council
Bob Menzies	Cambridgeshire County Council
Aaron Blowers	City Deal Partnership
Beth Durham	City Deal Partnership
Tanya Sheridan	City Deal Partnership
Joanna Harrall	City Deal Partnership
Graham Watts	South Cambridgeshire District Council

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence had been received.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 3 November 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

4. **QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

No questions from members of the public had been received.

5. **PETITIONS**

No petitions for consideration by the Joint Assembly at this meeting had been received.

6. **CITY DEAL PROGRESS REPORT**

The Joint Assembly considered the City Deal progress report.

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, in presenting the report confirmed that workshops in relation to the Histon Road and Milton Road schemes were nearly complete, with a report anticipated back to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in March 2017.

Regarding the Strategic Risk Register, it had been agreed by the Executive Board to report those risks on an exceptions basis where they had significantly escalated. Tanya Sheridan reported that the City Deal Programme Board had considered risk 4 on the Risk Register, which comprised a failure to engage effectively across relevant stakeholder groups on the City Deal vision, and in reassessing those scores recommended revised scores of an inherent likelihood of 4 and impact of 4, together with a residual likelihood of 3 and impact of 4. Actions were being taken to manage that risk. Tanya Sheridan explained that this issue had been brought to the attention of Joint Assembly Members at this stage inline with the exception reporting approach agreed by the Board.

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

7. **WESTERN ORBITAL - PUBLIC CONSULTATION OUTCOMES AND NEXT STEPS**

The Joint Assembly considered a revised version of the report which had been published as a supplement, summarising the outcomes of the consultation on possible future options for bus and cycle infrastructure improvements along the Western Orbital corridor.

Ashley Heller, Team Leader of Public Transport Projects at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report and highlighted the following key messages received in response to the consultation exercise:

- over 64% of respondents supported the need for public transport improvements along the corridor;
- over 67% of respondents felt it was important or very important that cycling and pedestrian facilities were improved within this scheme;
- the greatest support was given for option A, consisting of a route on the existing M11, with 61.8% supporting or strongly supporting this option;
- 53.4% of respondents supported or strongly supported option B, east of the M11;
- the greatest opposition was shown for option C, west of M11, with 43.1% opposing or strongly opposing this option.
- the majority of respondents supported the concept of Park and Ride, with the greatest support expressed for a new Park and Ride site at the Junction 11 exit of the M11, with 70.9% of respondents supporting or strongly supporting this option;
- over 70% supported a Park and Ride and/or a Cycle and Ride at Junction 12 of the M11.

Mr Heller reported that the outcomes of the public consultation would form part of the ongoing strategic assessment of options. He acknowledged that the Western Orbital scheme had a close link with the Cambourne to Cambridge Better Bus Journeys scheme on the A428. This would be taken into account as part of ongoing assessment work which he expected to be complete by July 2017, at which time the Executive Board was programmed to make a final decision on options for detailed consultation on the Cambourne to Cambridge scheme.

Mr Heller highlighted the ongoing communication with Highways England in terms of its development proposals for the M11 motorway and anticipated that Highways England would provide further clarity on longer term measures to be taken on the M11 during 2017 when its next Route Investment Strategy was set out. He expected the City Deal to engage at the highest levels with Highways England to influence this process. In view of the timescales relating to Highways England's decision-making in this respect, Mr Heller made the point that any significant decisions by the City Deal Executive Board on this scheme at this stage were not essential, particularly given that currently the Western Orbital scheme was an unfunded tranche 2 scheme.

Helen Bradbury, Chairman of the Local Liaison Forum, reported that the Forum had decided not to meet in order to consider this report since it did not put forward any recommendations on preferred options. The Local Liaison Forum would instead meet on 17 January 2017 and give consideration to the report and, committing to circulate a full statement of discussions and any resolutions passed, asked that its recommendations be given due consideration in shaping the preferred options.

With regard to the Western Orbital scheme, Helen Bradbury raised the following points that had been discussed at previous meetings of the Local Liaison Forum:

- whilst the Local Liaison Forum could see the benefits of an on-road Western Orbital route with bus only slip lanes in linking the north-west and west Cambridge sites to the Biomedical Campus, it did not believe that sufficient evidence had been provided on projected usage and commercial viability to justify the expense and environmental impact of an off-road solution;
- the Local Liaison Forum supported the idea of extending the current Park and Ride site at Trumpington to capture more motorway traffic;
- the Local Liaison Forum did not support siting a new Park and Ride at Hauxton on the west side of the M11 and instead favoured bringing forward an extended Foxton level crossing interchange project into tranche 1, which could accommodate bus, rail and cycle users as part of the existing plans. This would be a better location for people to transfer onto sustainable modes of transport as it would capture traffic before the congestion began on the A10 and link with the mainline railway station;
- the idea that Park and Ride locations should be sited further from the city had been consistently made by the Local Liaison Forum;
- the question of how the Western Orbital would connect with the Cambourne to Cambridge busway remained unclear, whereas an on-road Cambourne to Cambridge busway would connect directly. The Local Liaison Forum therefore wanted to see a full assessment made of A428 Cambourne to Cambridge options that made better use of existing infrastructure.

In respect of the A428 Cambourne to Cambridge scheme, the Local Liaison Forum had agreed a recommendation to the City Deal Executive Board that the hybrid scheme it proposed to the Assembly and Board in September 2016 be fully assessed as an alternative to options 3 and 3a of that scheme on the basis that it made better use of

existing infrastructure. She raised a number of points in support of this recommendation, saying that no valid two-way comparison using existing infrastructure had ever been made, with the only option that addressed using existing infrastructure not fitting the basic criteria of the scheme. She also claimed that comparative journey times used to assess the different options were misleading.

In addition, Helen Bradbury asked whether misinformation regarding the capacity of the Junction 13 bridge, and then the non-disclosure of contrary information, had influenced the options assessed and the decision taken. She referred to a report produced by Atkins in May this year, claiming it had not been made publicly available but which stated the opposite view to that given by officers. The Local Liaison Forum therefore believed that the bridge did have the capacity to take four lanes, could be widened to the north or to the south, or could be supplemented with a bus-only or cycle-only bridge directly alongside it and would be a tiny fraction of the cost of the new bridge advocated by officers.

Helen Bradbury asked the Joint Assembly to support the following:

- given the new information on the Junction 13 bridge, recommend a full appraisal of the hybrid solution proposed by the Local Liaison Forum, including transparent evaluation of strategic fit, benefit-cost ratio and wider economic benefits;
- note that key information was misrepresented or not disclosed that was relevant to the feasibility of solutions which made use of existing road infrastructure;
- pause all further work on preferred option 3a until this was completed;
- in light of the results, reconsider whether the preferred option 3a was the best strategic fit, or the most sensible solution.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, asked officers to respond directly to Helen Bradbury regarding her points on the A428 Cambourne to Cambridge scheme since the item under consideration at this meeting was the Western Orbital scheme. He acknowledged, however, that the two schemes were closely linked. It was agreed that all Members of the Joint Assembly would be sent a copy of the response.

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, explained that the strategic case behind the Western Orbital scheme was to collect areas of significant housing growth in north-west and south-west Cambridge, together with significant employment growth sites in those areas.

Bob Menzies, Director of Strategy and Development at Cambridgeshire County Council, in respect of bus patronage made the general point that the number of bus rapid transit passengers was increasing whereas traditional bus services were seeing their passenger figures decrease. In relation to rail and bus passengers and cyclists, Mr Menzies acknowledged that a lot of different passenger flows needed to be catered for as part of this scheme. Referring to the east/west railway, which was a route from Bedford, he reported that officers were currently looking at what potential routes along that broad corridor could be delivered but made the point that the Assembly and Board would be some way off knowing what these proposals may consist of, thereby supporting the case that this should be a tranche 2 consideration. Foxton level crossing had originally been included in the tranche 1 programme on the basis of it being fully funded by Network Rail, who had since made a decision to remove this scheme from its funding programme. Discussions with Network Rail would continue in respect of delivering that scheme.

Mr Heller made the point that there would be operational issues with a Park and Ride site if it was located too far away from the city on the basis that the further away they were, the more expensive the operational costs would be. In order to make bus use effective, bus

priority would also need to be introduced in both directions. In the case of Foxton, therefore, he explained that this would mean creating a long stretch of bus priority on the A10 in both directions. He added that a Park and Ride on the M11 junction would pick up two-way traffic, whereas a site at Foxton would only pick up the traffic travelling in one direction.

Councillor Hickford referred to the ongoing liaison with Highways England in terms of its developing proposals for the M11 motorway, noting that 2017 was the point where their proposals were likely to be known and where the City Deal could have an influence, with a final decision anticipated in 2019/20. He said that the outcome of this liaison with Highways England was hugely influential as to what the Executive Board would ultimately decide to do with the Western Orbital scheme. He asked how robust negotiations had been so far.

Mr Menzies reiterated that Highways England had its own strategies and programmes and that in 2017 it would be consulting on its five year plan. The City Deal and other key stakeholders would be consulted upon with the intention of putting the plan before the Department of Transport for approval in 2019. The City Deal and other key stakeholders would therefore have an opportunity to influence that in 2017, with Highways England being very open to suggestions put forward, but he emphasised that the Department for Transport would make the ultimate decision. Mr Menzies made the point that Highways England and the Department for Transport had to consider the whole network, not just that of the network in the Greater Cambridge area, so other councils, partnerships and bodies would be seeking to influence the outcome too. The City Deal would therefore need to press Highways England during that period of consultation to ensure that those schemes on the network within the Greater Cambridge area were considered as priorities.

Councillor Bridget Smith reflected on what she called the Foxton interchange and requested that it no longer be referred to solely as Foxton level crossing. She felt that this was more than a level crossing project and was effectively an interchange and transport hub. She also emphasised that the Greater Cambridge City Deal included South Cambridgeshire and that there was more to this scheme than linking up with new developments in Cambridge. Councillor Smith stated that lots of people in South Cambridgeshire used their cars due to there being no public transport services available, so a facility such as an interchange at Foxton where they could park their cars and then proceed with journeys on public transport or bicycle would be an extremely useful facility for them. She also felt that there was the potential to extend the footprint of the site due to land adjacent, owned by the County Council, being available which could see additional car parking spaces added to support this opportunity to create an effective transport hub serving the city and South Cambridgeshire.

Sir Michael Marshall highlighted Girton interchange as another significant issue and felt that the City Deal also needed to coordinate with Highways England regarding that aspect of the infrastructure inline with City Deal schemes. He felt that representatives of Highways England should be invited to attend a meeting of the Joint Assembly. Mr Menzies agreed to extend such an invitation. He reminded the Assembly that the Girton interchange had been considered by Highways England as part of the A14 regrading Development Consent Order and reasons were given at that time as to why the proposal for Girton interchange did not go ahead as part of the regrade. Mr Menzies offered to share this with Joint Assembly Members.

Councillor Noel Kavanagh asked why, if the Local Liaison Forum had access to the document, why Joint Assembly Members had not been given access to the Atkins report referred to by Helen Bradbury. Mr Heller explained that the Atkins report had been presented to the Local Liaison Forum in June 2016 and was therefore been publicly

available from that point. It was agreed that a link to this document would be sent to all Members of the Joint Assembly.

Dr John Wells made the point that consideration should be given to the strategic overview of the scheme, to include the designing of transport solutions, before any decisions were made regarding the physical infrastructure. He emphasised that system integration was a key aspect of this scheme.

Dr Wells in respect of Park and Ride locations made the general point that if the current 38,000 journeys a day by private motor vehicle into Cambridge were converted to travelling by bus, each Park and Ride site would need to be able to accommodate approximately 5,000 parking spaces for each of the radial routes. He made the point, therefore, that considering in so much detail a single Park and Ride site did not grasp the magnitude of the problem. Dr Wells acknowledged that for the purpose of illustrating this point these purposely very high level calculations had assumed that all car traffic would transfer to public transport, which he accepted was not realistic.

Dr Wells reflected on the City Deal's strategy of modal shift from private motor vehicle to public transport or sustainable transport and creating segregated bus provision to remove the congestion. These were considered to be fundamental principles so he subsequently questioned why he himself, despite all of the things he had previously mentioned already being available to him via the guided busway, chose to drive to where he worked at Addenbrooke's. Dr Wells therefore called for further work to be undertaken to explain why he and many other people like him were not mode shifting when the infrastructure and services were currently there to enable people to do so.

Mr Menzies accepted the significance of the challenge the City Deal was facing regarding modal shift, but said that a key contributing factor to the example put forward by Dr Wells was that people commuting to work currently had places to park their cars. He also reiterated that people were using the guided busway and that people had already changed their travelling behaviour as a result of its introduction.

In terms of the points raised regarding Park and Ride, Mr Menzies saw the solution not just as Park and Ride provision but also in getting people on buses from other areas where they lived so that they were not having to drive along the corridor at all. This solution would rely upon people cycling and using trains as well as buses, emphasising that there had to be a mix of methods of transport available to people.

Councillor Kevin Cuffley felt that the report had concentrated on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, whereas he saw Sawston as a key hub with its science park and residential development. He was disappointed that very little reference had been made in the report to Sawston station, when the infrastructure in the area was ready to be utilised, which he thought would take pressure off other links. Councillor Cuffley also felt that the report did not make enough reference to bus journeys to and from southern sites.

Councillor Tim Bick welcomed Dr Wells' analysis and agreed that the City Deal had an obligation to get people from where they lived to where they worked. He was disappointed with the composition of the consultation responses in that the majority of people responding were not really daily travellers along that route at peak times of the day, which was the main issue seeking to be addressed as part of the scheme. In terms of considering an on-road or off-road M11 option, taking into account the timescales associated with knowing the details of Highways England's programme, Councillor Bick said that it was likely that an off-road scheme would be looked at further particularly in view of the congestion along the motorway which currently existed. In terms of an on-road option he said that the real test in transport terms would be whether this could achieve the

City Deal's objectives. Reflecting on the consultation questions, he sought clarity as to what basis people were being asked the questions on as there appeared to be a lack of context to the questions in the document.

In terms of the question in the consultation document on Park and Ride, Councillor Bick highlighted that this was the same type of conceptual question that had been experienced with the A428 Cambourne to Cambridge scheme. He was therefore of the opinion that there was not enough information or evidence to form a view as to the exact location of a Park and Ride site at this stage of the scheme.

Under the options heading of the report, Councillor Bick highlighted that an option that had not been recommended to the Executive Board consisted of officers working up and recommending a preferred option for the Western Orbital in 2017, allowing for full integration into the Cambourne to Cambridge scheme. He asked why this had not been put forward as a recommendation as part of the report.

Mr Heller, in response to the point made about consultation responses, reported that extensive documentation had been circulated throughout the area and that there was very little control officers had in terms of the numbers and type of responses received to a consultation such as this.

Addressing the point regarding the option set out in the report which had not been put forward as a recommendation at this stage of the process, Mr Heller explained that the Western Orbital was a tranche 2 scheme and that its demand was more future orientated, which may explain why there was a relatively low response to the consultation. He added that the consultation was relatively high level and conceptual and sought to ascertain how people saw the future of transport provision along that corridor.

Mr Heller reported that officers had been asked to undertake a comparison of Park and Ride sites as part of the A428 scheme, which would assess the following:

- accessibility;
- relatively;
- operational ease;
- frequency of services;
- cost;
- opportunity for further development;
- environmental impact.

Claire Ruskin asked whether there was an evidence base for traffic flows, together with projections for future use along the corridor. In terms of modal shift, she made that point that people were unlikely to make the shift if it meant having to make a change at the later stages of their journeys and that hubs further away from the city should help address that aspect of modal shift.

Mr Heller confirmed that statistics were available, both in terms of existing data and projections, and had been used for strategic modelling.

Helen Valentine felt that the consultation document had not portrayed the scale of the challenge that the City Deal was confronted with and was keen to see this data be incorporated in the future as part of the consultation documentation.

Councillor Bridget Smith questioned why a Park and Ride site located further away from the city would cost more to operate as a site. Mr Menzies explained that a site too far away from the city would mean that it cost the operators more to run the service, meaning that passengers' ticket prices would be increased to make up for the additional cost which in turn could result in people choosing not to use the facility. He said that each Park and Ride site would need to be considered on its own merits and that the whole system, such as operational issues, had to be included as part of that consideration.

With 12 votes in favour and 1 abstention, the Joint Assembly **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board:

- (a) Noted the responses to the consultation on the Western Orbital bus infrastructure improvement scheme.
- (b) Agreed the next steps as set out in the report for the ongoing strategic assessment of the Western Orbital scheme as part of the City Deal programme to supported related potential Tranche 1 schemes.
- (c) Agreed to take a key role in working with Highways England to establish clear priorities along the M11 corridor and for these discussions to form part of the next report on the Western Orbital.

8. **M11 JUNCTION 11: BUS ONLY SLIP ROADS**

The Joint Assembly considered a report which provided a summary of the further assessment of a southbound bus only off slip road at Junction 11 of the M11.

Ashley Heller, Team Leader of Public Transport Projects at Cambridgeshire County Council, presented the report and explained that the assessment undertaken did not support a standalone bus only south bound off slip road, but confirmed that some options may be deliverable albeit with associated risks. It was noted that there remained uncertainties as to the long term plans of Highways England for the M11 as well as potential land use planning issues associated with the junction which would require further clarification. Mr Heller outlined that the proposal reflected a very small stretch of bus priority along an extremely long and congested corridor but recognised that there were issues with this particular junction and that intervention would be necessary in view of employment growth in the area. In his professional opinion, Mr Heller felt that it was more sensible to consider the junction in the context of the Western Orbital scheme, with the junction featuring as part of a modular scheme potentially around Park and Ride intervention.

Councillor Bridget Smith supported the recommendations contained within the report and made the point that no buses currently travelled along the route, calling for the project to be dropped at this stage.

Andy Williams corrected some of the statistics quoted in the report at paragraphs 5 and 6 of the report in relation to AstraZeneca, Papworth Hospital and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, which he felt underestimated the size of the problem. He also made it clear that AstraZeneca had in fact relocated from London, not Chester as stated in the report. Mr Williams reiterated the significant demand that would be placed on this junction as early as 2018 when Papworth Hospital moved to the site, reminding Members that AstraZeneca already had 2,000 additional employees located on the site and that there would be a further 6,000 employees as a result of growth around Sawston. He added that 50% of Papworth Hospital employees had indicated that they would use a bus service if there was one in operation. Mr Williams said that something needed to be in place before 2018 and

was therefore keen for something to come back for consideration in the future, particularly around what could be done in respect of Park and Ride.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, highlighted that a report on this issue was scheduled for reporting back to the Joint Assembly and Executive Board at their meetings in July 2017.

Claire Ruskin was interested in the traffic modelling information and felt that this should be made available. She also made the general point that the City Deal was seeking to make businesses more accessible and practical for people, which should be taken into account as part of considering this specific project.

Councillor Tim Bick was of the opinion that any improvement gained as a result of implementing these measures would be minimal and supported the recommendations contained within the report, saying that it was necessary to think more strategically.

Councillor Noel Kavanagh referred to the subsidy that had been offered, equating to 3 buses an hour, and asked where that would come from in the longer term.

Councillor Dave Baigent felt that this project presented a very important opportunity to test the City Deal and deliver something that could prevent a huge problem on the M11. He therefore felt this was something that should be followed through.

Councillor Hickford made the point that the recommendation in the report was not seeking to reject anything, but instead ensure that this aspect of the scheme was right.

The Joint Assembly **RECOMMENDED** that the Executive Board agreed that the M11 Junction 11 south bound bus only off slip road concept should be integrated into the Western Orbital project ensuring that any strategic transport and economic benefits may be realised and that a sustainable phased proposal could be developed.

9. TRANCHE 2 PRIORITISATION

Consideration was given to a report which updated the Joint Assembly on the work necessary to prioritise transport infrastructure schemes for delivery in the second tranche of the City Deal programme.

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, presented the report which set out the proposed approach and timetable for developing and agreeing tranche 2 transport priorities for the City Deal. It was noted that a number of changes, most notably the agreement of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, presented opportunities that should be explored early in the next phase of this work. Tanya Sheridan reported that the Executive Board was therefore being recommended to add that aspect to the previously agreed scope and approach for the project, together with the undertaking of further work to develop the prioritisation criteria and methodology and a number of other aspects including:

- to explore the merit of potentially creating a rolling investment fund and/or a small schemes fund;
- to develop a proposed long list of schemes;
- to assess those and hence derive a recommended set of investment priorities for the City Deal post-2020.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, reflected on references made in the report to the Local Plans of Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire and highlighted that they had still not gone through the examination process. He also acknowledged the moving landscape in respect of the recent commitment by the constituent authorities to sign up to a devolution deal for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. He questioned whether this item should be deferred until the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority investment criteria and strategic economic plan refresh were available in February 2017.

Councillor Bridget Smith was unconvinced that it should be the City Deal's role to set up a fund for transport infrastructure or other measures, citing the highway infrastructure grant as an example of a similar facility already in place. She questioned how this fund would be managed.

Claire Ruskin was keen to see the City Deal develop its tranche 2 programme through discussion in order that a clear view of people's priorities could be established. Andy Williams supported this approach and said that the partnership needed to think about how it could leverage outcomes with other schemes being delivered outside of the City Deal. He added that a common message would help communicate the City Deal's objectives to the general public.

Dr John Wells said that the holistic transport plan for the Greater Cambridge area needed to be considered as part of the tranche 2 discussions, with outputs being a priority.

Councillor Tim Bick felt that it was important to start discussing the tranche 2 programme and any potential joined up approaches. He was broadly supportive of the recommendations but sceptical with the grant based approach that was being proposed.

Councillor Hickford agreed to convey the Assembly's concerns regarding the grant funding proposals to the Executive Board.

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

- (a) Agreed that the headline objectives for the tranche 2 prioritisation exercise are:
- to prioritise transport infrastructure investments to prepare those which best meet the City Deal's strategic objectives for delivery when funding becomes available;
 - to ensure that those investments support the growth strategy set out in the Local Plans and the supporting Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire;
 - to ensure the prioritisation is aligned to wider work by the Local Enterprise Partnership on the Strategic Economic Plan and of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority.

- (b) Recognised dependencies between ongoing tranche 1 work, the Local Plan examinations, the work of the Combined Authority, the Economic Assessment Panel, the tranche 2 prioritisation exercise and tranche 3 and agrees that potential alignment and synergies with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority be explored;
- (c) Agreed that the previously used criteria and methodology should be reviewed and built on and that the Executive Board, Joint Assembly and other stakeholder input be sought on assessment criteria and methodology and the 'long list' through workshops in early 2017.
- (d) Noted existing commitments to consider particular schemes through the tranche 2 prioritisation process and confirms these.
- (e) Agreed to receive a further report in June recommending the prioritisation methodology and criteria and long list process, as well as the potential for synergies with the Combined Authority and other bodies.
- (f) Agreed officers should explore potential use of a proportion of future City Deal funding to:
 - create a potential 'rolling fund' for investment in transport infrastructure/ measures to unlock early growth from which a future repayment revenue stream would follow;
 - create a fund for smaller scale measures (likely to be those costing less than £500 000) that could be bid into to allow delivery of measures that unblock localised barriers to growth and provide strong economic benefits in line with City Deal objectives.

and noted that these options will be brought back to the Executive Board with the proposed long list in September 2017.

- (g) Endorsed the outline timetable for recommending transport investment priorities for tranche 2 and notes the key dependencies.

10. DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSPORT CONSULTATION ON WEBTAG

The Joint Assembly considered a report which set out the principles to be incorporated into a combined City Deal response to the Department for Transport's consultation on proposed changes to the estimation of wider economic impacts in transport appraisal guidance.

It was unanimously agreed that the word 'combined' should be removed from the recommendation contained within the report, to remove any potential confusion relating to Combined Authorities.

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

- (a) Agrees to submit a City Deal response to this consultation, in addition to the responses that the partner organisations may wish to make individually.
- (b) Agrees that the City Deal response should be framed around the principles set out in paragraph 13 of the report.
- (c) Delegates to the City Deal Programme Director, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Executive Board and Cambridgeshire County Council's Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment, responsibility for submitting a full response to this consultation in accordance with these agreed principles.

11. CITY DEAL FINANCIAL MONITORING

Consideration was given to a report on the City Deal's financial monitoring position for the period ending 31 October 2016.

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

12. CITY DEAL FORWARD PLAN

Consideration was given to the City Deal Forward Plan.

Tanya Sheridan, City Deal Programme Director, highlighted that briefing meetings in respect of the Histon Road and Milton Road schemes were in progress, with update reports scheduled to be presented to the March 2017 cycle of meetings of the Joint Assembly and Executive Board. It was also noted that consideration would be given to the determination of Traffic Regulation Orders in respect of cross city cycle improvements at that cycle of meetings.

Councillor Maurice Leeke pointed out that there was no mention in the Forward Plan of the implications of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority in terms of its potential impact on the City Deal.

Tanya Sheridan agreed that this was something that could be brought back to the Joint Assembly, particularly regarding the establishment of the Combined Authority and timings of key events, such as the election of the Mayor for example.

Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Joint Assembly, agreed to discuss this further with the Programme Director in order to establish the best way of taking it issue forward.

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

The Meeting ended at 4.00 p.m.
