



## **CAMBRIDGESHIRE & PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY: MINUTES**

**Date:** Wednesday 31 October 2018

**Time:** 10.30am – 12.15pm

**Present:** J Palmer (Mayor)

G Bull – Huntingdonshire District Council, S Count - Cambridgeshire County Council, L Herbert – Cambridge City Council, J Holdich – Peterborough City Council, C Roberts - East Cambridgeshire District Council, C Seaton – Fenland District Council and B Smith – South Cambridgeshire District Council

**Observers:** R Bisby (Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner) and J Bawden (from 10.35am) (Clinical Commissioning Group)

### **248. ANNOUNCEMENTS, APOLOGIES AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The Mayor welcomed Patrick Arran to his first meeting since his appointment as Interim Monitoring Officer. He also highlighted the Chancellor's Budget Statement on 29 October 2018 which had included £21m for infrastructure projects, £20m for east/ west rail and £675m for transforming high streets, which would align with the Board's market town strategy.

Apologies were received from J Ablewhite, Police and Crime Commissioner, who was substituted by R Bisby, Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner.

There were no declarations of interest.

### **249. MINUTES – 26 SEPTEMBER 2018**

The minutes of the meeting on 26 September 2018 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

### **250. PETITIONS**

No petitions were received.

### **251. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

Councillor Chris Boden was not in attendance to ask his question in person so his written question was read to the Board. *(The question and the response are published*

at the following link: [Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority meeting 31 October 2018](#) and attached at **Appendix A**).

In addition to his written response to Councillor Boden the Mayor stated that that his comments would be taken on board when Item 2.5: A605 Kings Dyke Level Crossing Closure was considered later in the meeting.

## **252. FORWARD PLAN**

The Board reviewed the Forward Plan of Executive Decisions which was published on 29 October 2018.

Councillor Herbert commented that the agenda for the meeting on 28 November 2018 was very full. He queried the level of detail which would be included in the Budget Update 2018/19 report and emphasised the need to be transparent. Councillor Herbert welcomed the Independent Remuneration Panel Review of Allowances report, but queried exactly when and how remuneration arrangements for the Business Board had been agreed as he did not recall this having been brought previously to the Combined Authority Board.

The Interim Chief Finance Officer stated that the Budget Update report would include a full capital and revenue split as well as expenditure by project.

The Interim Chief Executive stated that payment of an allowance to the Chair of the Business Board had been established via a Mayoral Decision Notice on 25 June 2018. This was reported to the Combined Authority Board on 25 July 2018 (Item 1.7 refers) in the minutes of the Business Board meeting on 25 June 2018. All Business Board decisions were submitted to the Combined Authority Board for ratification.

It was resolved unanimously to:

note the Forward Plan.

## **253. APPOINTMENT TO BUSINESS BOARD**

The Board considered a recommendation to appoint Councillor Wayne Fitzgerald as substitute for substitute for Councillor Charles Roberts, Portfolio Holder for Economic Growth, on the Business Board in place of Councillor Anna Bailey.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) appoint Councillor Wayne Fitzgerald as substitute for Councillor Charles Roberts, Portfolio for Economic Growth on the Business Board.

## **254. MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMBINED AUTHORITY AND COMMITTEES – AMENDMENTS**

The Board considered changes to the substitute membership of the Combined Authority Board and Overview and Scrutiny Committee which had been notified by Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council.

It was resolved unanimously to note:

- a) the appointment by Cambridgeshire County Council of Councillor Ian Bates temporarily as its substitute member on the Combined Authority Board;

- b) the appointment by Peterborough City Council of Councillor Shaz Nawaz as one of its substitute members on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the municipal year 2018/19.

## **255. £100m HOUSING PROGRAMME – SCHEME APPROVALS**

Councillor Roberts, Portfolio Holder for Housing and Chair of the Housing and Communities Committee, stated that there was insufficient housing to support the region's strong and growing economy and the situation in relation to affordable housing was particularly acute. It was hoped that the Whittlesford scheme described in the report would encourage similar projects elsewhere in the region. The Director of Housing and Development stated that Whittlesford was a grant-supported scheme which would support the delivery of 43 shared ownership homes and 17 Affordable Rent homes instead of the 60 Open Market homes originally planned.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) commit grant funding of £1.634m from the £100m Affordable Housing Programme to support delivery of new affordable housing scheme at Lion Works, Station Road, Whittlesford.

## **256. COMMISSION OF THE LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN**

The Mayor invited Councillor Lucy Nethsingha, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to advise the Board of five issues raised by the Committee in relation to the report. Councillor Nethsingha stated that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had discussed the report at length and that her five observations came with the Committee's full endorsement. These were:

i.)The Committee requested that the Heavy Commercial Vehicle route map was taken into account and was integrated fully with the Local Transport Plan. The importance of consultation was highlighted.

ii.)The Committee raised concerns around the assumptions made over North/ South priorities over the East/ West within the report and wondered how this assumption had been reached. There were also concerns raised that there appeared to be no reflection of the issues raised in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review (CPIER) report.

iii.)The Committee wanted to know that the level of consultation with District Councils at the initial stages would be thorough to allow the Councils to incorporate the Local Transport Plan into their local plans. The Committee was keen that the Local Transport Plan should take account of District Councils' role.

iv.)The Committee wanted reassurance that the Combined Authority would have the resources to manage the significant public interest expected when the Local Transport Plan went out for public consultation.

v.)If the consultation responses created a need for Phase Three to be re-written would the Combined Authority be prepared to adjust the Local Transport Plan.

The Transport Programme Manager stated that following the Devolution Deal, the Combined Authority had become the Local Transport Authority with strategic transport powers for the areas previously covered by Cambridgeshire County Council and

Peterborough City Council. Appendix 1 set out the four stages of work proposed which would be supported by a number of complimentary strategies. Supporting inclusion and growth across the whole of the Combined Authority area would form a key assumption and work would take account of existing business cases and strategies. The statutory public consultation exercise would run for 12 weeks and was planned to begin in early 2019.

Councillor Herbert welcomed the clear timetable set out in the report, but queried whether the Spring 2019 timeframe would allow time for adequate engagement and reflection. He commented that it would be important to align with Local Plans and to link in with the non-statutory Spatial Plan. He also asked for a response to the points raised by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

The Transport Programme Manager stated that the timelines proposed included flexibility in the period for analysis and reflection on the response to the public consultation and engagement events. In response to the questions raised by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee he stated that:

- i.) The Heavy Commercial Vehicle Route map and LTP would be aligned;
- ii.) When the brief was drawn up it was designed to ensure that the whole of the Combined Authority area was considered;
- iii.) There had already been two rounds of engagement with District Councils. There was an open and on-going dialogue with District Councils and this would continue throughout the process;
- iv.) There would be internal staffing resources available to handle the response to the public consultation and officers were working with Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council to understand the likely volume of responses;
- v.) The production of the LTP and implementation plans would run alongside the public engagement and consultation exercise so the Plan would incorporate and respond directly to the feedback from the consultation.

Councillor Count commented that the LTP involved a very complicated timetable and welcomed the fast timeline. If this subsequently needed to be reviewed then it would be, but it was good to aim for quick action. He commented that it would be important to address known issues such as building a relationship with rail timetabling bodies as well as those responsible for rail infrastructure. There were also a number of unknown variables such as the possible creation of new railway stations, increased use of battery powered cars and autonomous vehicles. There was no question that plans would be altered as necessary to take account of the public consultation. Councillor Count further commented that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's concern about priority being given to North/ South projects appeared to be based on a misunderstanding. A focus on building the economy of the north of the region was built into the Devolution Deal and the CPIER report. Improving transport links was one way of achieving this.

Jessica Bawden asked whether Public Health was being specifically consulted about the impact of the LTP. Councillor Holdich commented that there was a need to engage with Public Health, local Health and Wellbeing Boards and local councillors and to work up an action plan. The Transport Programme Manager stated that some engagement had already taken place with Public Health and that this would continue.

Councillor Smith asked how mindful officers were of the recommendations of the CPIER report and whether there would be continued engagement with CPIER. Officers confirmed that the CPIER report constituted a fundamental part of the evidence base for the LTP and would form the platform on which the Plan would be built.

In response to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's representation on geographical priorities the Mayor stated that there were many projects underway which focused on the East/ West axis, including those to be considered later on the agenda. This formed a significant part of what the Combined Authority was striving to do. There was also the £20m investment in East/ West rail which he had referenced earlier in the meeting (minute 248 refers). Councillor Holdich had also raised the significance of improving the rail connection between Peterborough and Birmingham. The Combined Authority was lobbying the rail operator for better provision, including more regular stops at stations in Fenland and more carriages on trains.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) agree the scope of the Local Transport Plan for the Combined Authority;
- b) agree the stakeholder engagement strategy.

## **257. EAST-WEST (NORTH) CORRIDOR – A47 DUALLING STUDY – STRATEGY, PHASING AND PRIORITISATION STAGE 0**

The Transport Programme Manager stated that a strategic outline business case (SOBC) had previously been considered by the Board in June 2018. The current report contained a refined SOBC and three route options. The Mayor and officers had met with the Chief Executive of Highways England in July 2018 and subsequently with Highways England technical and commercial teams and the advice received had been encouraging. Officers would produce a suite of information to specified standards which would enable Highways England to compare schemes nationally. The request before the Board to approve additional funding of up to £1m consisted of £800k to establish a supply chain and meet County Council and land costs plus a £200k contingency fund. Approval was also sought for the continuation of Skanska consultancy support under the existing County Council framework, around 75% of which had been completed to date. The options appraisal took account of Local Plans and included sensitivity testing in relation to Wisbech Garden Town. The Mayor commended the Transport Programme Manager for his report and the work which lay behind it.

Councillor Count commented that the proposed dualling of the A47 was vital and necessary and should be delivered within the proposed 2027 timeframe. It provided a crucial route within Cambridgeshire, Peterborough and Norfolk and was vital to support local businesses and their workforce. Improving infrastructure was a key aspect of the Devolution Deal and Authorities with strong plans already developed would be well-placed to move quickly when funding was available. Assuming the proposed dualling of the A47 went ahead there did not seem to be the need for a full rework of the Guyhirn roundabout, although some remedial works would be necessary to address the situation at Guyhirn until 2027. It would also be prudent to reserve the position on Guyhirn in case the proposed A47 dualling did not progress. On that basis he supported the continuing dialogue on this issue between the Director Transport and Highways England. However, his view was that all delegations of authority to officers should be subject to consultation with the relevant Committee Chair. To this end, Councillor Count proposed an amendment to Recommendation (e), seconded by Councillor Seaton, that the Board:

delegate authority to the Transport Director, *in consultation with the Chairman of the Transport Committee*, to consider and negotiate the concept of *amending* the continuation or cessation of the current proposed Highways England Intervention at Guyhirn, to then utilise the funding in the development of the wider scheme.

On being put to the vote the amendment was carried.

Councillor Holdich commented that the proposals made absolute sense. It was a good report, but he would have liked to see more information on the project's benefits as well as the challenges.

Councillor Seaton stated that he fully supported the report. However, the proposal went beyond improving the transport infrastructure and was actually a means of supporting economic development across the whole route. For that reason his preference would be refer to the project as an economic corridor.

The Mayor restated the importance of the economic corridor between Peterborough and Norwich which dualling of the A47 would support. This had been identified in the CPIER report and it was shameful that it had not been done before. People were continuing to lose their lives on a dangerous road and he welcomed the Board's unanimous support for the proposal.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) note the findings of the revised A47 Strategic Outline Business Case, and Options Appraisal Report which confirms that a strong case exists for the dualling of the whole section of the route;
- b) note the three identified route options being developed to the standards of both HE DCO Compliant PCF Stage 0 and SGAR;
- c) approve the continuation of Skanska consultancy support via the existing Cambridgeshire County Council framework arrangement and Budget of additional funding of up to £1,000,000, (at a level of £800,000 plus £200,000 contingency subject to CEO / CFO release) for the development of HE DCO Compliant PCF Stage 0 products to achieve a Green SGAR approval;
- d) note the need to identify funding for a contribution towards the development stage of up to £30,000,000 of an estimated total £60,000,000 over the period 2019 to 2025 as a contribution to the design and development of the preferred route;
- e) delegate authority to the Transport Director, in consultation with the Chairman of the Transport Committee, to consider and negotiate the concept of amending the continuation or cessation of the current proposed Highways England Intervention at Guyhirn, to then utilise the funding in the development of the wider scheme.

## **258. CAMBRIDGE AUTONOMOUS METRO: UPDATE**

The Mayor invited Councillor Lucy Nethsingha, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to advise the Board of two issues raised by the Committee in relation to the report. Councillor Nethsingha stated that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

- i.) requested that more detail be included in future reports and asked if the remit that was provided to the consultants to produce this work could be provided to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee;
- ii.) requested that further information around financing be provided.

The Mayor stated that he took the Committee's comments on board and would reply in due course. He invited Alison Norrish to introduce the report. Ms Norrish was a highly experienced engineer with significant experience in delivering complex underground projects, including Crossrail. Her work was now jointly commissioned by the Combined Authority and the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP).

Ms Norrish stated the report before the Board provided an update on the Cambridge Autonomous Metro (CAM) project and specifically those decisions taken by the Board in July 2018. Production of a Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC) remained on track for delivery in December 2018. Combined Authority and GCP officers assisted by consultants had reviewed the proposed A428 Cambourne to Cambridge route and Arup had produced a summary of that review, a copy of which was appended to the report as Appendix 1. Providing infrastructure links to the central CAM scheme was critical.

Councillor Smith commented that she had thought the Board would be receiving a full and independent review of all of the current data. Instead, it had received three pages of unsubstantiated narrative. She supported the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's request to see the specification for the consultant's report. She had received numerous complaints from local residents regarding the proposals and the report before the Board did nothing to build confidence. Councillor Smith criticised a tweet which had been posted the previous day which referred to 'battling with Nimbys' which she felt was contrary to the work which local councillors were doing with local residents. If a segregated route was to be pursued she felt that a strong case must be made for it, containing more detail. The report stated that the proposed route was the optimal solution, but there was nothing in the report to substantiate this.

Councillor Herbert acknowledged Councillor Smith's observations and commented that he felt it would be helpful to the work of the GCP and demonstrate that the Combined Authority was following a good process if a PowerPoint presentation and supplementary information which had been provided in another forum was published. If the off-road proposal was supported this would be consistent with the CAM project and would help deliver it. The clarity around the type of vehicle to operate the route was also welcome. Councillor Herbert committed his efforts along with the GCP to help deliver the project. He did though take the point made by the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee that the funding of the CAM project must be evidenced.

Councillor Count welcomed the interim report before the Board, noting that the full Business Case containing detailed information would be submitted to the Board in December 2018. Given that this was an update report only he judged that the findings contained at paragraph 2.8 were at the right level for now to illustrate the direction of travel. The body that had determined the route was the GCP and the purpose of the Arup report was to examine whether that process had been robust and had followed due process.

Councillor Smith commented that there seemed an intention to pass the buck to the GCP and possibly South Cambridgeshire District Council about the decision on the Cambourne to Cambridge route. The Mayor had stated that the route had to align with the CAM project so in her view the final responsibility for the decision rested there. There was a need to be clear that there was currently no funding for the CAM project and residents were being asked to accept a route predicated on the CAM. She was

concerned that the route would become a white elephant if the CAM project did not proceed. If that should happen it would not be the responsibility of the GCP or South Cambridgeshire District Council. On that basis she judged it was appropriate to ask for the evidence and facts now.

The Mayor stated that the bottom line was that the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review had made absolutely clear that the Combined Authority must get on with the CAM project to enable the economy in Cambridge to grow and thrive. The intention was to deliver a world class infrastructure project. Ms Norrish had been frank in her initial view that a Cambridge underground transport system could not be done. However, having examined the proposals in detail she had concluded that it was achievable, affordable and could be delivered in the timescale proposed. She had further confirmed during the course of the meeting that work to build the necessary funding was on-going and would be delivered by the end of the year as part of the SOBC. The Mayor acknowledged the strength of Councillor Smith's views and the concerns of the residents of Coton and stated that the consultation process must have real strength and merit. However, there was an absolute need to address the Cambridge transport nightmare. Sustainable public transport was the answer, and the Combined Authority would work alongside County, City and District Councils to deliver this.

It was resolved by a majority to:

- a)note the progress of the CAM project towards the production of the Strategic Outline Business Case by December 2018
- b)agree the outcomes of the review of the A429 Camborne to Cambridge project, following the pause agreed at the July Combined Authority Board meeting
- c)note the progress of the work to assess the potential delivery models to ensure the priority transport projects (including the CAM) can be delivered at pace.

## **259. A605 KINGS DYKE LEVEL CROSSING CLOSURE**

The Transport Programme Manager stated that the A605 was identified as an economically important corridor between the Fens and Peterborough. At present there were around 120 train movements per day across the level crossing. At peak periods the waiting time in both directions was significant, as was the impact of queueing traffic on local residents. The North Bank provided an alternative route from Whittlesey to Peterborough, but ran through the Nene Washes flood plain and was often closed to traffic during the winter months. Approval was sought for a further £16.4m funding contribution in addition to the £13.6m allocated originally to meet additional costs relating to technical issues and an increase in the cost of land acquisition issues. County Council officers had assured the processes regarding land purchase by agreement rather than by compulsory purchase. This was also supported by legal advice. A probability and impact assessment had been conducted and had produced an 80% confidence level that the project would be delivered within a £30m budget so there was still an element of risk, predominantly in relation to the variable elements of the scheme. It was proposed that a member of the Combined Authority Transport Team should sit on the project board throughout the construction period to ensure a robust degree of challenge. Any over or underspend against the revised project budget would be apportioned on a 40/60 basis between Cambridgeshire County Council and the Combined Authority.

Councillor Herbert commented that he definitely saw the need for the project, but it was only 14 months since the initial figures had been provided and he would like to understand why some of the costs in the table at paragraph 2.12 had doubled. The

The Transport Programme Manager stated that the preliminary design had made certain assumptions and some of these had been revised in the detailed design. This included additional strengthening required on land adjacent to a disused clay pit, safety improvements and future-proofing of roundabouts and the retention of access to enable an existing business to continue to operate. In relation to the land acquisition there had been an element of optimism in relation to the initial valuation, but legal advice confirmed that the land should be identified as being of commercial rather than agricultural value. The revised cost would still represent around 13% of the total costs and for a project of this type land costs of between 10-15% were generally expected. The increase in relation to management and supervision costs were due to the complexity of the delivering the scheme within the timescale required whilst the increase in risk costs reflected his assessment of the level of risk involved given the complexity of the scheme.

Councillor Holdich commented that there was challenge from some quarters that the Combined Authority was not doing enough for Peterborough. The clear advantages of this scheme might prove to be as important over time to Peterborough and Fenland as the dualling of the A47 economic corridor.

Councillor Count commented that there was both a technical and a human dimension to the project. On the technical side the scheme had doubled in price. This increase had been challenged both by Combined Authority and County Council officers and independent external advice had been commissioned to provide an assurance that the revised price was reasonable. The business case and reported revised benefit cost ratio (BCR) demonstrated that the scheme continued to represent good value for money. On the human side, the figures demonstrated the real damage being done to peoples' lives and the local economy. The Combined Authority would not commit to improved infrastructure at any cost, but in this case the assurance process in relation to increased costs had been robust, there was a strong BCR case and the project remained vital.

The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner commented that this was a good scheme, but that Stanground Access was also a traffic bottleneck and that this needed to be addressed too. The Mayor stated that £2.4m had been put forward to address the issues at that junction and the Transport Programme Manager undertook to confirm the expected works date.

The Mayor stated that the Kings Dyke level crossing project was an example of the why the Combined Authority had been set up. Local people wanted the works carried out and the Combined Authority was working with Cambridgeshire County Council to deliver it. The Mayor also paid tribute to Councillors Martin Curtis and David Connor for their passionate support for the project.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) note the independently reviewed Business case supporting the progression of the scheme as value for money;
- b) agree to provide funding contribution of up to £16.4m over the original £13.6m allocation to enable the scheme to progress to construction;

- c) agree the appointment of 40 / 60 as a split of any under / over spend against the above budget between Cambridgeshire County Council and the Combined Authority as set out in the report.

## **260. PERFORMANCE REPORTING**

The Mayor invited Councillor Lucy Nethsingha, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to advise the Board of an issue raised by the Committee in relation to the report. Councillor Nethsingha stated that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee felt that the performance reports that would be sent to the new Committees should contain greater detail than the overview report that would be sent to the Board.

The Director of Strategy and Assurance recommended that performance reporting to the Board should reflect Devolution Deal commitments and take the form of a simple, proportionate and clear document which was accessible both to Board members and the public. It was proposed to submit quarterly reports from November 2018 onwards contained six indicators based around political and Devolution Deal priorities. Red – amber - green (RAG) ratings would also be provided on a core of priority projects. Committees would set their own performance reporting requirements and he would expect those to contain more detailed information.

Councillor Smith commented that the illustrative graphs contained in Appendix 1 referred to 2,500 affordable homes, whereas the actual minimum figure specified was 2,000. She suggested that the actual graph should instead say affordable homes with no specified figure to allow scope to be more ambitious. The Director for Strategy and Assurance stated that the figure of 2,500 reflected the total number of new homes which would be delivered through the £100m Affordable Housing Programme and the £70m Cambridge City Housing Programme.

Councillor Herbert commented that the report was useful. He would though want fuller detail on projects requiring further examination. It would be important to illustrate value for money evidence-based targeting in comparison to how money was used. The Director for Strategy and Assurance agreed about the linkage of budget reporting and value for money and stated that RAG ratings would be set in a rules-based way.

Councillor Count commented that the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review (CPIER) had stressed the need to build up robust performance analysis to support project proposals. There was a need to monitor what was required to meet the test of gateway processes as well as for internal assurance purposes.

Councillor Roberts highlighted the significant time commitment demanded of Board members in addition to their responsibilities in their home Authorities. Ways must be found to refine the way in which the Combined Authority interacted with elected members going forward. He welcomed assurance which the regular performance reporting would provide in relation to key projects and commended the clear and concise nature of the £100m Housing Programme: Scheme Approvals as an exemplar for future Board reports to enable the Board to use its time to best effect and focus on clearly defined issues. This did not extend to Committee reports where it was accepted that a greater level of detail would be required.

It was resolved by a majority to:

- a) agree the proposed performance reporting arrangements described in this paper.

## **261. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The Combined Authority Board will meet next on Wednesday 28 November 2018 in the Council Chamber, Fenland Hall, County Road, March PE15 8NQ.

(Mayor)

**CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY – 31<sup>st</sup> OCTOBER 2018**

**PUBLIC QUESTION**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question</b>
1.	Councillor Chris Boden (Cambridgeshire County Councillor and Fenland District Councillor)	Mayor James Palmer	<p>Does the Mayor agree, when allocating public money to major infrastructure projects, that it is appropriate to make such decisions using objective criteria (such as the Department for Transport's Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) measure) and that that measure provides exceptionally strong evidence for the Combined Authority to support funding the construction of the King's Dyke bridge?</p> <p>I am asking this question as delays caused by the current level crossing at King's Dyke are a social and economic cost for every resident in Whittlesey.</p>
	<b>Response from:</b>	<b>Response to:</b>	<b>Response</b>
	Mayor James Palmer	Councillor Chris Boden (Cambridgeshire County Councillor and Fenland District Councillor)	Decisions related to Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) funding for transport infrastructure projects are taken in accordance with the CPCA assurance framework. That includes being consistent with the Department for Transport's (DfT) WebTAG appraisal guidance.