

Growth Partnership Board Meeting
1st June 2011, 1000 – 1200
Cambs FA, Bridge Road, Histon, Cambs

Growth Partnership Board Members Present:

Name

John Williamson (JW)
Simon Payne (SP)
Gary Garford (GG)
Liz Bisset (LB)
John Onslow`
Joseph Whelan (JW)
Malcolm Sharp (MS)
Jo Mills (JoM)
Giles Hughes (GiH)
Laura Halstead (LH)

Authority

Cambridgeshire Horizons
Cambridge City Council
Fenland District Council
Cambridge City Council
Cambridgeshire County Council
Cambridgeshire County Council
Huntingdonshire District Council
South Cambridgeshire District Council
East Cambridgeshire District Council
Cambridgeshire Horizons

Additional Attendee(s)/Substitutes:

Geoff Bruce (GB)
Paul Mumford

Cambridgeshire Horizons
Cambridgeshire Horizons

Minutes:

Gill Barker (GDB)

Cambridgeshire Horizons

Apologies:

Alex Plant
Steve Plant
Steve Hampson

Cambridgeshire Horizons
Huntingdonshire District Council
South Cambridgeshire District Council

Actions

1. Welcome and Apologies

JW welcomed all attending and reported the apologies noted above.

2. Minutes of the Meeting held on 1st March 2011 and matters arising.

The Minutes were agreed.

Matters arising:

Item 2 – PECT Survey results now available on Horizons website. Link to be circulated with Minutes of this meeting;

Item 3 – Legacy issues, senior group of officers had now met, report later on Agenda;

Item 6a) – Quarterly Housing figures issue still being considered;

Item 7 – CLIP alterations ‘log’ had now been circulated;

Items 10 and 12 – On this Agenda.

GDB

3. Major Sites Programme and Key Issues (inc SRR and A14)

JW's report had been circulated. Points of particular note:

Under 1.3 – A14 – There are two separate ‘studies’ concurrently: 1) DfT Strategic Study, and 2) Local ‘Capacity’ study;

Under 2.0 - SRR – Audit & Risk meeting will study and recommend as required to Board. No major changes on Register since March 2011, with the A14 and Housing issues remaining at ‘Red Risk’;

Under 3.0 – Cambridge Southern Fringe (CSF) progressing well, with Community Centre Programme to be completed 2014/15. Spine road over Cambridge Guided Busway (CGB) now commenced and should be completed prior to opening of CGB. Skanska involved in the early phase of Clay Farm had given this a supportive review, as had the Quality Panel;

Under 3.5 – Trumpington Meadows – Infrastructure work not yet commenced but is imminent. Primary School application before Committee in July.

Discussion:

- NIAB Site (350), meeting with Barratt to discuss funding of new modelling work, results of which could persuade Highways Agency(HA) there will be ‘nil detriment’ to A14 and unlock further 650 units;
- Noted that Barratt site was an immediate problem for A14, but there are others. Catherine Brookes of Highways Agency has noted the issues and agreed that the HA will do everything in its power to assist further development, but the ‘nil detriment’ policy must stand. Updating old and outdated modelling may prove extremely useful provided funding can be found to accommodate this technical work. Noted that recent surveys seem to have shown traffic levels have fallen due to impact of rising fuel costs, the recession etc., and these could be exploited once modelling carried out;
- This modelling work needs to be carried out in an holistic manner, and because of the importance, a request has come forward for HGF Revenue funding which will come up later on this Agenda;
- Noted that the DfT Study is now due to complete earlier than first thought, but that the first Senior Steering group meeting of this Study is still awaited;
- Under 3.9 – Cambridge University Site (NW) – Planning application in by August and is intended that a Member Briefing will be held in June;
- One-Pagers:
 - Huntingdon Town Centre – HGF Capital issue;
 - St Neots progressing well, application expected late 2011, the east

extension will strengthen the Town Centre;

- Appendix 1 – Red Risks - Housing issues - Noted that first round of bidding to government by Housing Associations under the new Affordable Housing product had just closed, with outcomes known mid-July. Some Housing Associations had opted not to bid at all. Reported that the Cambridge Challenge sites had bid as a single package with a mixture of 80% and 60%. Noted that this bid round had been oversubscribed. Cambridge City Council and SCDC were currently modelling the effects of the new legislation. Further reported that the reply to Horizons Chairman’s letter to Housing Minister had failed to answer any of the questions asked. Agreed that a further letter should be drafted seeking actual answers;
- Noted that a Member briefing was being held at SCDC in June for which a briefing note would be compiled which could be shared;
- Appendix 3 – Northstowe – will become a one-pager for Main Board. First phase of 1500 homes. Masterplan changes required, going to Northstowe Parish Forum for agreement in July;
- East Cambs Market Towns – Seminar in July which will consider options;
- Wisbech – will become a one-pager. All infrastructure now in place and soft marketing starting on sites.

4. HGF Capital and Revenue Budgets:

JW’s report had been circulated. Main points:

Capital - £26.5m, with over £20m spent at end of March and remainder committed;

Revenue - £1.9, with £1.1m spent at March 2011 and anticipate that majority of remainder will be spent by end of year. £230k currently unallocated, with Main Board previously having agreed that monies should be retained for ‘emerging priorities’. Main Board had also recently agreed £35K for SmartLife Fenland Retrofit project. There were now 3 additional requests for funding: 1. A14 – £50K toward the funding of new modelling work to re-assess capacities, 2. Up to £50K for Northstowe Viability work, and 3. £35K to complete the funding for the SHMA as a Legacy issue through to year end and other arrangements.

Discussion:

- Query whether better for any ‘unspent’ Horizons funds to be dealt with collectively in broader context;
- Query re LCDI governance, as AP steps down from Board at end of June. Noted this was being addressed. Also, wording on LCDI re Northstowe project required clarity. Noted;
- Query regarding amount of £35K for SHMA? Noted that this represented part year costs to cover funding to end of financial year. From April 2012 other arrangements were being organised between the relevant authorities. LB to check that £35K was correct;
- Query whether CIL Revenue support was an existing project? Noted and paper for Board to cover this. Also, paper should reflect assistance to accelerate ECDC into CIL project;

JW

LB

JW

Agreed:

Subject to Board paper reflecting comments above, the three additional funding requests and the Board paper content were agreed.

JW

5. Horizons Residual Funding

JW's paper sets out likely amounts of remaining funds at the end of September 2011 and Options for its use which alongside comments from this meeting will form the basis of a paper to Audit & Risk.

The three areas of residual funding are:

1. Reserves pot of approx. £425K; 2. HGF Revenue pot of approx. £100K; and 3. CLG Transition Fund successful bid for £163K, paid over two years.

There is also the 'Rolling Fund + Investment' pot of £20.5m, which could be more if investments make a return, and there is a proposal from a previous ARM meeting to maintain Horizons as a non-trading shell company to deal with these monies as they return post 2017, the detail of which will come to September Board, and will involve Founder Members only.

Altogether, around £500K could be available at the end of September 2011.

Options: A) Divide between all local authorities; B) Growth projects within Cambridgeshire on ad hoc or bid basis; and C) A combination of (B) and short term capital for the LEP. Peterborough also benefitted from CLG funding of £163K, and if Option C) were agreed, this could lever further resources from them.

Discussion:

- Query whether the intention was for Horizons Board to make this decision? Noted: Yes. SP reported uncertainty and a lack of capacity in the LEP, noting that it is important that these monies are utilised for housing and the delivery of infrastructure in Cambridgeshire. The LEP had wider geographical boundaries. Also, it would be useful to have a distinction between 'reserves' and other unspent monies. Suggestion that a request for bids to support the delivery of housing & infrastructure should be called for;
- Reported that Opportunity Peterborough was continuing as an organisation and would support the LEP 'in kind' by way of Neil Darwin's time etc;
- Noted that resources for the LEP were currently unknown, but with each local authority involved (13) pledging a minimum of £7.5K each in money. This does not provide even a core team to service the LEP;
- General agreement that the main issue was being lost, namely individual amounts of £70K or less, within each authority, would do nothing. To focus on delivery of any kind required the monies to be in one pot. Query whether this 'pot' could be ring-fenced within the LEP for Cambridgeshire and if not, then possibly Option 'B' with a group, similar to current GPB, to use to help delivery;
- Noted that with Horizons being wound down, capacity and resources getting smaller almost daily. Need to work smart. Possibly consider the value of identifying potential uses, and then match that with emerging priorities of the LEP. Time available to organise this for June Main Board extremely limited;
- Option A should be removed;
- Wording for Option 'C' needs to be changed removing 'deficiency' funding;
- Noted that Cambridge City Council would not support Option 'C';
- Noted that there was a need to influence the LEP as it would be talking to government, and to remember that 'we' are part of the LEP not outsiders;

Agreed:

Paper for Board to be reworked. Individual streams of money to be identified. Principles of Options 'B' and 'C' and the merits to be outlined for Board consideration.

JW

6. **Horizons Work Programme and Transitional Issues**

JW's paper had been circulated. This identified what work will continue, post Horizons, and where it will 'sit'. These workstreams are clearly identified under 2.3, and include CIL, CRIF, CEF, SHMA, LCDI and QP; The LCDI Board issue to be resolved over the next week or two;

Discussion:

- Noted that the LCDI Board issue needed to be a separate issue on the Board Agenda;
- Page 4, last line to be omitted, or state 'by prior consultation with all la's';
- Page 5, Carbon Offset Mechanism, add in 'a forward look';
- Page 9, Cost Benefit Analysis, ditto;
- Page 11, Website, noted that this would be live for a further two years, paid for in advance.

7. **LEP Update**

LH reported that the LEP Board had the approval of Government Ministers, with two meetings now held. The Terms of Reference had been agreed and it had been decided, after a vote, to hold meetings in private with all Notes made public subsequently. A recent Strategy Awayday had proved useful to refine the Vision from the original bid. AP and Neil Darwin (ND) were currently working up the skeleton of a business plan for Board to discuss at the June meeting on 13th. Funding of £48K had been allocated from the government's Capacity Fund. The LEP was making an Enterprise Zone bid from a short list of 5 possibles. PWC were assisting regarding this. All and any benefits from achieving an Enterprise Zone will be shared across the LEP area. The LEP does require a dedicated resource, currently working through AP and ND plus goodwill assistance from inside Horizons and Opportunity Peterborough.

Discussion:

Query as to the five EZ candidates? 1. Fenland; 2. Hunts; 3. Peterborough; 4. Bury St Edmunds; 5. Kings Lynn.

8. **Green Infrastructure Strategy Review**

Paul Mumford's paper had been circulated. He noted the main points. It was now intended to obtain 'sign off' from Main Board, having been through all partner member processes and gained endorsement. The Strategy now covers the whole of Cambridgeshire, providing continuity for Local Plans within the County. There had been two rounds of public consultation and was a triumph of partnership working. Both rounds of public consultation had been supportive. The Green Infrastructure Forum has been the main operational part of the Strategy.

Agreed:

To recommend 'sign off' to Main Board.
PM was congratulated on his efforts to bring this a conclusion.

9. **CRIF and CEF update**

Sheryl French's paper gave an update in two integral projects. The main issue was that this work would still be ongoing and outstanding at the end of September, 2011, and would require management from there.

The recommendation in 5.0:

- i) note progress on the projects and the risks to delivery by September 2011;
- ii) agree that £25K Housing Growth Funds already allocated to the CRIF

project is used to support the completion of the CEF and CRIF work during Oct 2011-January 2012, the work to be coordinated through Cambridgeshire County Council;

iii) to be aware of the development of EU funding bids to secure finance for the proposed Low Carbon Hub and its role in supporting the ongoing delivery of the CRIF and CEF; and

iv) encourage members to attend an event on 15th June 2011, 2.15-16.15 at Shire Hall, Cambridge explaining the CRIF project.

Agreed:

All recommendations, as above, agreed.

10. Future of Growth Partnership Board

JW noted that this was on the Agenda as it had been intimated previously that members found this meeting extremely useful and wished to continue with a 'GPB type' meeting going forward.

Discussion:

Noted that there was unfinished business which went beyond the remit of County Planners, and certainly until the residual funding issue was resolved, discussion on which would continue to the next meeting;

A GPB type meeting enabled co-ordination and communication across the County, but still need to see where the LEP will 'sit' in the structures;

Agreed:

Item to be on final Agenda in September

Agenda

11. Review draft Agenda for Main Board

Agreed.

12. Any other Business

JoM noted an event on Localism being held on 29th June at Hilton. Each local authority had 12 places. JoM to circulate information.

JoM

13. Date of Next Meeting:

Tbc, but late September 2011.