

**Growth Partnership Board
Minutes of the meeting held on
Thursday 6th March, 2009 at 1530-1730
The Long Room, Murray Edwards College, Cambridgeshire County Council**

BOARD MEMBERS:

Alex Plant	Cambridgeshire Horizons
John Onslow	Cambridgeshire Horizons
Peter Studdert	Director of Joint Planning
Simon Payne	Cambridge City Council
Liz Bisset	Cambridge City Council
Mike Hosking	Cambridgeshire County Council
Graham Hughes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Steve Hampson	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Jo Mills	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Malcolm Sharp	Huntingdonshire District Council
Steve Plant	Huntingdonshire District Council
David Archer	East Cambridgeshire District Council
Giles Hughes	East Cambridgeshire District Council
Gary Garford	Fenland District Council
Chris Hodson	Fenland District Council
Rebecca Yee	Fenland District Council
Geoff Bruce	Cambridgeshire Horizons

Apologies:

Mike Hosking	Cambridgeshire County Council
Jo Mills	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Chris Hodson	Fenland District Council
David Archer	East Cambridgeshire District Council

Also in attendance / substitutions:

Laura Halstead	Cambridgeshire Horizons
----------------	-------------------------

Minutes:

Gill Barker	Cambridgeshire Horizons
-------------	-------------------------

Actions

1. Welcome and Apologies

Apologies were received as above.

2. Minutes of the meeting held on 8th January 2009

The Minutes were agreed.

Under Item 3 – A revised Terms of Reference had been circulated. All Terms were now agreed. Under Membership – where titles of relevant members from each local authority were noted, it was agreed to change Director of Housing and Community Development to 'Community Services'.

Under Item 4 – the updated Strategic Risk Register was later on this Agenda;

Under Item 7 – the LAA was later on this Agenda.

3. Programme and Key Issues

A paper setting out the overview of the updated SRR had been circulated. The basic concept was outlined. The SRR was now structured in line with the LAA Outcomes. Risk identification remained red/amber/green, with mitigations highlighted separately with 'smiley faces'. Each Risk clearly showed ownership. This document was still work in progress. Columns I-P now included Growth areas. Programme Managers from the City, County and South Cambs had been involved. Hunts, East and Fenland District Council programme managers were now required for input.

Discussion:

- Were there plans to rescore after mitigation to establish whether risk reduced?
- New layout generally agreed as being helpful – need to ensure does not become too complicated;
- Cover sheet needs to capture all areas requiring immediate attention/decision;
- East, Hunts and Fenland programme managers to be involved in extending this document to cover the growth area, to be identified and contact made with GB.

GB

4. Proposed HGF Capital Programme

JO noted two copies of this report previously circulated. One was the paper which went to the Joint Strategic Growth Implementation Committee, and was for information only.

The second, which was before this meeting, was the paper which had previously been circulated for the Members briefing on 12th January, and sets out the proposal for broad spectrum of funding for the next two years.

JO then outlined the proposal, noting that Appendix 2 showed the principles for allocation agreed by Horizons Board in December 2008.

The proposal – in brief:

- Quality of Life Projects (Green Infrastructure)– 10% top slice;
- Urban Fringe Sites Flexible Fund – 50% - to work with developers/landowners . Consultation with developers had taken place. Emerging from this was that the Southern fringe was ‘ready to go’. Discussions with developers at Trumpington Meadows and Clay Farm areas. This had resulted in a potential to bring forward Trumpington Meadows quickly with a ‘loan type’ arrangement. Clay Farm was more complex.
- Market Towns involved key areas of growth regeneration projects;
- Key one-off projects such as the ICE Project;

All of the above would form a proposal to Main Board on 25th March. Adaptability and flexibility were the key issues and it was intended to seek delegated powers from Main Board to move this forward.

Discussion:

- The ICE project was queried. JO reported that the International Climate Exchange (ICE) involved delivering a low carbon innovation enterprise centre and education hub, and a centre of excellence in low carbon focussed enterprises. The project involved the Smartlife Centre and CRC and other stakeholders. It was agreed that JO would circulate more information on this including a link to their website to members;
- The flexible fund, on its own, would have insufficient funds to bring forward all areas. It was noted that the HCA were open to discussion on where further funding might be available;
- Existing major sites such as Orchard Park still to be considered;
- It was noted there was now a move away from the historic grant agreement approach to a more flexible funding method giving some return;
- Monitoring of the flexible fund will be crucial, with new process to enable this currently being worked up. Programme managers will involved, with updating report to this meeting;

JO

GB

GDB

Agreed:

- To invite David Arkell, Head of Innovation and Partnerships at the County to be asked to present to the next meeting regarding the ICE project;
- HGF proposal report to be forwarded to Main Board for approval, and delegated powers.

5. **Cambridgeshire Prospectus**

The draft report had been circulated. AP noted that this draft had now been forwarded to Terry Fuller at HCA for comment.

The resulting comments from Terry Fuller and this meeting would form the final document to go before Main Board. This document would become the means of the 'single conversation' required by HCA, as evidence of the well developed cross partnership working available. Section 7 highlights the specific proposals.

Discussion:

- It was queried whether the specific proposals required actual figures of funding required, or perhaps some specific examples;
- It was noted that the paper was designed to be a more tactical approach, but following Main Board approval this idea could be progressed;
- Northstowe would require considerable government funding above and beyond the scope of this document, and it should be considered as a 'starter for 10';
- Under Section 5 – 3rd paragraph – should this now include the wider growth area?;
- It was noted that this paragraph shows the remit of the formal joint planning area, but could then be extended to show the new growth area separately;
- Alignment with other bodies was crucial, in particular the GCP;
- It was noted that the Integrated Development Plan, next on the agenda covered the wider economic/spatial focus;
- Longer term, this document, if dynamic, could be utilised for informing many other organisations/boards.

AP

Agreed:

It was recommended that this document be put before the Main Board for agreement. Once finalised, it should become a core document and processed as such.

6. **Integrated Development Plan**

The draft document had been circulated. AP noted that SQW were the consultants involved. It was still a work-in-progress paper setting out the economic and spatial opportunities of the area. EEDA have been involved and have part funded, and have shown a willingness to consider their future funding opportunities in regard to it. This could be an important additional source in the future. The report tries to combine all the aims and ambitions for the future. Directional comments required.

The document will go before Main Board as a draft, seeking structured comments.

Discussion:

- General agreement that this was an extremely useful

document;

- With regard carbon challenge, does this paper go far enough?;
- It was noted that a similar document produced by a Midlands authority resulted in significant assistance with funding from the larger government bodies, particularly with regard to regeneration issues;
- Spatial packages do not currently show the over-arching specific issues such as A14;
- It was noted that the Thematic packages pick this up;
- Section 14 – Market Towns required further population. ECDC and Fenland representatives to assist;
- Some outcomes were specific and some unclear. It was noted that in some cases this was because the document was still a working draft, but in others the outcome could not be crystallised;
- If the document was to be used as a method of obtaining funding, then the 'hooks' need to be evident;

GiH/GG

Agreed:

- An extremely useful document;
- Carbon challenge section to be expanded;
- Section 3 to come before Section 2;
- Section 14 to be expanded;
- Post Main Board, a timetable to be circulated on further development of this document.

AP

7. Cambridgeshire LAA – Managing Growth Update

JO noted that Horizons Main Board had been assigned this task by the LAA, with David Bard as our representative Cambridgeshire Together Board Member. As such Horizons would hold a key role, becoming the overseer for Growth in the Cambridgeshire area. A draft copy of the report to be presented to the Cambridgeshire Together Board had been circulated for comment. JO gave an overview.

Discussion:

At a Sub-regional Housing Board meeting recently, It was noted that targets for future housing were being revised, yet figures for affordable housing do not seem to move with the same significance or percentage. This could cause confusion;

Agreed:

Any further comments by Wednesday 11th March.

All

8. Green Infrastructure Review

David Bethell, Green Infrastructure Review Project Manager of Horizons/Cambridgeshire County Council, gave a presentation outlining the current Strategy with implementation details, and the

reasons for a review at this stage.

Main Points:

- Launched in 2006, the GIS provides multi-functional benefits to communities and biodiversity and supports sustainable growth;
- Delivery is by a wide variety of partnerships and funding has predominantly been from GAF/HGF and Lottery;
- Review required at this stage to strengthen relationships and to encompass the wider area, now having full county coverage;
- It will also enable a suite of projects to be identified for future funding initiatives such as Variable Tariff/Community Infrastructure Levies;
- It delivers within the Cambridgeshire Together targets of Managing Growth, Economic Prosperity, Environmental Sustainability, Equality and Inclusion and Safer and Stronger Communities;
- Proposed timetable for the review sets out progress so far, and identifies future milestones, with the new Strategy being completed by Christmas 2009.

Discussion:

- This local partnership involves many stakeholders, with a need to ensure all planners get sight of it;
- Important that this Strategy forms part of the IDP to ensure future funding;
- Strategy has key messages about the benefits, not just for the converted, but for those still sitting on the fence;
- Should be adopted as a high core strategy, it provides robust evidence;
- Review needs to update all evidence fully, as it now covers a larger area;
- Two-tier spatial representation - thematic representation in the first draft IDP, with more detailed document at the district level;
- CAGE features this strategy.

9. Review of Main Board Agenda

AP noted the considerable size of the Main Board draft agenda. There were three clear sections, the third of which, Item 12, was a 5-part issue surrounding future funding. He gave an overview of these.

Discussion:

Item 12(d) – Presentation on Variable Tariff – it was agreed that MS would part deliver, thereby allowing EDAW to stand down;
Item 16 – HGF Flexible Fund – Main Board to be asked to delegate powers regarding this issue to JSGIC. It was not necessary, therefore, to hold this under closed session.

MS

GDB

10. Meeting Dates – forward planner

A copy had been circulated. AP requested any future agenda items to be circulated by email.

11. Any other business

There was none.

12. Date of the next meeting

This was confirmed as 9th June, 1400-1600 Cambridge Housing Conference Rooms, Histon.