

**Cambridgeshire Horizons Board  
Minutes from the Meeting held on  
Tuesday 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2010  
The Moller Centre, Storeys Way, Cambridge**

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Sir David Trippier (Chair) (SDT)	Cambridgeshire Horizons
Cllr Dr David Bard (DB)	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Ian Bates (IB)	Huntingdonshire District Council
Cllr Jill Tuck (JT)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Fred Brown (FB)	East Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Sian Reid (SR)	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Alan Melton (AM)	Fenland District Council
John Dix (JD)	Greater Cambridge Partnership
Nigel Howlett (NH)	Housing Association Representative
Alex Plant (AP)	Cambridgeshire Horizons
Steve Sillery (SS)	Developers Representative
Steve Collins (SCol)	Homes & Communities Agency (HCA)
	Up to Item 8
Paul Kitson (PK) (sub)	Homes & Communities Agency (HCA)
	from Item 8
John Wilkinson (sub)	EEDA
Professor Ian White	Cambridge University
Richard Howe (RH) (sub)	Addenbrookes Hospital

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

Mark Lloyd (ML)	Company Secretary
Sue Beecroft (SBee)	Cambridgeshire Horizons
Michaela Henson (MH) (sub)	Taylor Vinters
Laura Halstead (LH)	Cambridgeshire Horizons
John Onslow (JO)	Cambridgeshire Horizons
Jamie Carr (JC)	Highways Agency
Peter Studdert (PS)	Director of Joint Planning
Anna Keyes (AK)	Cambridgeshire Horizons
Geoff Bruce (GB)	Cambridgeshire Horizons
Gill Barker (Minutes) (GDB)	Cambridgeshire Horizons

**APOLOGIES:**

Steve Cox (SCox)	EEDA (sub)
Steve Collins (SC)	Homes & Communities Agency (HCA) (sub)
Dr Gareth Goodier (GG)	Addenbrookes Hospital (sub)
Tim Freathy (TF)	GO - East
Dr Paul Zollinger-Read	Addenbrookes Hospital (sub)
Quentin Golder (QG)	Taylor Vinter (sub)

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

SDT noted apologies as above. He then sought agreement to bring forward Item 7 – Company Secretary’s report to enable the nominated replacement Board members to take their seats.  
This was agreed.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

SS – Under Agenda Item 8b – 2.3;  
JT – Any developer issue;  
AP – CRC, as on Board of Governors.

**3. Minutes of 9<sup>th</sup> December, 2009 and Matters Arising**

The Minutes were noted and agreed.  
Matters Arising: There were none.

**4. Minutes of the Audit & Risk Management (ARM) Committee of 4<sup>th</sup> March 2010**

The Minutes were noted. JB drew attention to Budgets for 2010/11, in particular that the forecast was for a £192K deficit, which was well within the reserves. He also noted that the budget papers had not been circulated with the Minutes. However, the Audit and Risk Committee had recommended them for approval. The papers would be circulated immediately after the meeting.

**GDB**

**5. Minutes from the Joint Strategic Growth Implementation Committee Meetings of 11<sup>th</sup> February 2010**

The Minutes were noted.

**6. Minutes from the Growth Partnership Board meeting of 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2010**

The Minutes were noted.  
Under Item 3 – JT queried bullet point 5, which stated ‘dialogue with Network Rail should be re-opened for a Plan B regarding Cambridge NorthWest’ as dialogue with Network Rail had been ongoing throughout.

Agreed:

To note an amendment to this section to reflect the above.

**7. Company Secretary’s Report**

ML’s report was circulated.  
The following nominations as Directors appointed by the Board were duly noted and approved:

1.1.1 Dr Paul Zollinger-Read nominated for NHS Cambridgeshire;

1.1.2 Professor Ian White nominated for Cambridge University;

The following nomination as Observer was received and agreed:

1.2.1. Jamie Carr for Highways Authority.

2.1 Detail of filing information regarding the statutory accounts 2009/10 was duly noted.

3.1 Review of the role of Chairman – action noted.

Discussion:

It was suggested that the EA should be invited to have a representative on the Board as an Observer. Discussion followed as to areas where this could prove beneficial.

Agreed:

That the EA be invited to send a representative as an Observer to future

**SDT/**

Board meetings. SDT to take forward, with ML's assistance.

## 8. Progress Report

### a) Update on Housing targets

SBee's report had been circulated. JO noted there had been a positive move upward in the market. The LAA targets had been successfully renegotiated from 3,800 to 3,000 which, although still challenging, was more realistic. Also, non key indicators, whilst not targets still had to be monitored and reported, and are currently being worked up. The Housing Board will report on these.

#### Discussion:

- Under Item 3.1.2 – Noted that report stated up to 150 p.a. future flexibility, but this cannot proceed without infrastructure. Queried how the study was proceeding, and what the Horizons Board could do to support this type of work. JO noted that the 'Shaping Fenland' study was taking a community strategy approach and will be integrated into the strategic planning process. There was also a Market Towns study awaiting launch which would consider the economic and employment aspects to assist in delivery of infrastructure, but there was a requirement to recognise limited funds. JT noted that the Planning was required, even if there was no funding, otherwise there is an inability to request funding. SCol drew attention to the HCA's 'Single Conversation', which was ongoing and looking at innovative ways of delivery. This work was being led by Horizons and District Authorities were involved in negotiations. There would be a Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) due to be completed by the middle of next year.
- It was further noted that the Shaping Fenland initiative had moved into overdrive, and now had a portfolio holder to lead. With 3,000 houses planned for March, infrastructure was key. Possibility to open up more land east of March, and the LDF process to be speeded up also;
- Noted that East Cambs roads heavily congested;
- Reported that the Government was again considering moving the Civil Service out of London. Efforts were being made to ensure the Cambridgeshire region is being considered – March, Ely or St Neots;
- Noted that the organisations Shelter and Centre for Cities had recently put out reports which raised criticisms of Cambridge authorities in terms of lack of progress on delivering houses. Some of the basis for this criticism was unfounded, but that we should respond by saying that we are doing the right things and share the concerns at being unable to build, and the real reasons for this need to be publicised. LH to assist with media coverage;
- The Clay Farm Appeal was a key factor, having been a difficult fight, the decision being good, not just for the Cambridgeshire county as a whole, but for the whole country;
- Commented that should Government be considering the East as a possible relocation site for the Civil Service, perhaps a good time to consider re-investing in rail for the area?
- Information required on timescales and the CSR were required. Noted there would be more discussion on this under Item 11a.

### b)

#### Major developments and infrastructure:

JO's report had been previously circulated. He drew attention to:

- 2.1.2 – Clay Farm Appeal and the Secretary of State's decision to uphold 40% Affordable Housing;

- 2.6.1 – Northstowe had been successful in £1.5m bid to assist in achieving Eco-Town status;
- 2.1/2/4 – Progress around the Fringe sites;
- 3.2.1 – Cambridge Gateway – Outline Planning stage awaiting S.106 agreement only;
- 1.6.3. – Typographical error of double negative, apologies, should read ‘considered unlikely that the Urban Challenge Fund (UCF) will be **able** to yield....’;
- 3.2.3 – The Hive project has been launched.

Discussion:

- Under 2.7 – Cambourne drainage is a serious issue. SCDC will refuse any further planning until this is resolved. Noted that the Uttons Drove scheme, involving the EA, Swavesey Drainage Board, HCA, SCDC, Cambourne Consortium and Horizons is trying to find a solution to enable further development at Cambourne, and for Northstowe. Reported that this was not purely a ‘pumping station’ issue. Surface water was getting into the system. Query whether the Fire Station planning application had been considered within the Making Cambridgeshire Count (MCC) initiative? Noted that this application had commenced long before the MCC process had begun;
- Under 1.5 – HCA Kickstart – Reported that two sites in Cambridgeshire had received funding through this scheme – Waterbeach and St Neots, plus two sites awaiting a due diligence decision within the next two weeks;
- Under 1.6.3. – Noted very disappointing news regarding the Government decision to scrap the Transport Investment Fund (TIF). Queried also whether there was any update on the A14 upgrade? Noted that there was currently a great deal of work going into the Local Investment Plan (LIP) for the HCA’s ‘Single Conversation’, plus other finance initiatives. It was agreed that the UCF will cover a wider remit and be a smaller fund, so less likely to produce sufficient funding for schemes. It was further noted that only an announcement of a potential UCF had been made, there was no guarantee a fund would result. It should also be noted that all authorities were planning future budgets on an assumption of 20% revenue and 50% capital funding reduction;
- JC reported that the proposal to upgrade the A14 was continuing through the early phases. Draft Orders had been published which should result in a Public Enquiry in October 2010. Should the proposal survive, work could start in Spring 2012, completion by 2015/16.

**9. Cambridgeshire Together (CT) Report – LAA and CAA Update**

JO gave a verbal update: the CT Board meeting for 23rd March had been cancelled. Horizons do submit a written report to this meeting, and this has still been forwarded to CCC. It will be circulated to this Board later today. ML noted that the major commissioners of services are getting together to review the construction of CT for the future.

**SBee**

**10. HGF Capital Programme 2009-2011 – Review of Progress**

JO’s report had been circulated. Of particular note under:

5.2 – Funding Agreements currently require spend by March 2011. A query had arisen as to whether there was flexibility beyond March 2011.

Discussion:

- Under 4.2 – March Housing & Regeneration Scheme, in light of

withdrawal of funding for College of West Anglia (COWA) was considered a lower priority than the Wisbech scheme, but should funding become available, Fenland DC would be first to request this scheme be re-prioritised. With FDC willing to use some capital reserve, and other partners now more interested, a funding kickstart could enable this scheme to proceed;

- Noted that other schemes in Cambridgeshire were in similar position and could lobby similarly. Suggested that flexibility regarding spend timing should be no more than 3-4 months;
- A further suggestion was that a project should have started by March 2011;
- Discipline within the project management was required. Noted that this was apparent already, but some projects were causing concern over ability to spend within the designated period;
- Noted that future funding would be affected by ability to spend current funding, but also by impending election and possible change of government;
- Noted that East of England always drew the short straw regarding funding;
- Query regarding Clay Farm funding. AP reported that the recent planning appeal decision has assisted, with the developers now wanting to go forward even at 40% affordable housing provision. The £8m investment is 'equity', alongside HCA funding. Scheme should start in July/August 2010. The equity investment (or loan) will be made subject to advice from our consultants.

Agreed:

Continued hold of funding for a project should be subject to that project having commenced during 2010/11, and being capable of completing within 3 months of March 2011.

**11. Investment Package Update**

**a) HCA's Single Conversation and the Local Investment Plan (LIP):**

AP's report and first draft LIP had been circulated. AP drew attention to why and how this work had commenced. It was to be used as an evidence base for the HCA's 'Single Conversation', along with the Prospectus, and work was ongoing in conjunction with the Cambridge Housing Board. It had been requested by the HCA in December, and followed up in February, and was now in early draft form for comment. It will eventually form part of an HCA submission for the next Comprehensive Spending Review. The draft circulated still requires individual authorities to populate some of their own information. The timeframes for moving this forward are noted within 3.2. SBee and Anna Keyes are both working on this, talking with colleagues from all local authorities. The next draft will need to return to the July Board meeting, and the resulting draft will then be required to go through each local authority process for endorsement by September to enable a final document to return to Main Board at the end of September for agreement. This will replace the current Programme of Development, or POD, submission to government for funding and needs to encompass growth, regeneration and infrastructure funding requirements.

Discussion:

- Noted that the draft document still refers to 'the Cambridge Sub-Region'. This phrase should be deleted and now referred to as Cambridgeshire;
- Document good, but requires clarification on transport issues;
- Need to be ambitious with this document as this will help direct HCA funding in the future. It should include transport issues where they impact on growth plans;

- Doubts expressed regarding future government funding – Risk of less funding for real infrastructure, and just more ‘studies’;
- All local authorities required to populate their own sections of the LIP, would this include Police, Fire, Universities, businesses? Noted that other agencies’ information is largely captured in the Integrated development programme, which is a key source document for the LIP. Go East have been a particular advocate of the joined up approach suggested by the ‘single conversation’. There is a big policy shift at the moment as all major parties are looking at greater localism;
- Document needs to be more strategic, rather than just a collection of local authority requirements, if it is to be attractive to the HCA (Government);
- Concern regarding the plethora of ‘plans’ being requested to be drawn up for ‘so called’ future funding opportunities;
- Document will require, and benefit from, an Executive Summary;
- Attention was drawn to Section 7 – final paragraph regarding Total Assets. This work is based on the government initiative ‘Total Place’, announcements regarding this in Budget could detail Cambridgeshire as a ‘pilot’ for this scheme. All local CEO’s, through the Cambridgeshire Public Service Board (CPSB) have been investigating this possibility. It is, at the moment, an idea to see whether pooling local assets could save money and improve investment capacity and efficiency.

Agreed:

- Document to give ‘total’ picture – spatial, economic, environmental, capital and revenue requirements to be useful to HCA;
- An Executive Summary to be provided;
- All local authorities to assist in populating own sections;
- Updated version to return to Main Board in June.

AP

b)

Community Infrastructure Levy/Tariff update:

AP’s report had been circulated. AP noted in particular that the government was proceeding with CIL. This will in part replace the current Section 106 system, which at the moment means that some 40% of new development (smaller sites) pay nothing toward infrastructure requirements. Regulations for CIL are expected to come into force on 6<sup>th</sup> April 2010. Hunts DC and East Cambs DC will lead the way and are ready to ‘pilot’ this scheme with everyone else linking in later. Officer groups are in place for the pilots and the wider county interests. Any change in government may vary CIL but there seems to be some acceptance of the principles.

Agreed:

Noted by all present with no queries.

**12. Quality of Life**

a) Green Infrastructure Review:

JO introduced this paper, highlighting the following main points:

1. The review of the current strategy, three years old, will widen it to the whole of Cambridgeshire and encompass biodiversity, education, health and climate change – a more holistic approach;
2. Aim is to strengthen the status of the Strategy and give a strong framework to support planning applications. It will, therefore, require the full engagement of all local authorities;
3. Consultation with the public has shown strong support for the

review. Section 4.4 of the paper highlights the areas brought to attention. It will now require much work to develop this into an evidence base, currently in the early stages of this.

4. Appendix 3, part 2, shows the timetable for future work and the next key stages, prior to a revised draft coming back to Board.

Discussion:

- Concern over processes at the beginning of this review was noted. Item 13 covered this issue for any such future work;
- General discussion regarding the possible benefits of Horizons carrying out this type of evidence-base work as opposed to each local authority carrying out its own analysis;
- Requirement to ensure that Planning officers are kept in the loop if it is to be of use to support Planning issues;
- This review has been led by a 'Steering Group' involving officers from all authorities;
- Principle service is to form an evidence base for future policy, akin to the work on the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA).

Agreed:

- General agreement that this was a useful process, which will come back to Board twice more. Some local authorities currently making extensive comment about their own areas, as part of the bigger jigsaw – further public engagement may be needed;
- SDT noted that Horizons role was intended to facilitate the local authorities, the SHMA being a good example of ways that this was possible;

b)

Carbon Offset Mechanism Update:

AP's report had been circulated. He noted that this work was continuing in conjunction with the Housing Board and the Environmental Sustainability Partnership. The approved consultants, Element Energy, had a representative present, Ian Walker, who would give a strategic overview of work carried out to date:

Ian Walker explained the basis for a carbon offset mechanism, the future dates which triggered higher expectations, 2016, 2020 and 2050, and identified the long term vision – and short term priorities, and how these might fit into the political and legal framework.

There were three key parts: the legal framework, the local policy level and the business case for a fund.

For the legal framework there were various different collection frameworks, including fund holding vehicles and corporate SPV's. These would allow for developers of smaller sites, where meeting government targets for carbon reduction would be cost inefficient, to pay into a 'pot' instead to set up a larger carbon reducing scheme elsewhere.

He then explained the timescales for implementation and the requirement for development of local policy frameworks to support the scheme. Local authorities would need to harmonise their LDF's.

Discussion:

- Some concern was expressed that this could be seen as yet another 'tax' on new development. However, the developers representative explained that it was likely developers would embrace this initiative as it could ease their burden of providing carbon efficiencies on sites that this would prove costly for;
- Noted that decarbonising was a political priority, and looking to source larger and/or more beneficial schemes should be considered as part of an overall plan;

- Local authorities should also be looking inwards, prioritizing a reduction in its own carbon footprint to lead the way;
- Fund would need to be 'held' locally and not in central government pots. Noted that a carbon offset fund would be held locally, to be used locally;
- Should consider existing communities and schemes as well as new;
- Ongoing reporting on this should show a rolling programme of viability issues;
- One suggestion for possible investment scheme could be alternative affordable and sustainable transport ideas.

Agreed:

General agreement that the scheme was a good idea.

c)

Cambridge Climate Change Charter and 10:10:

Sheryl French's paper had been circulated. Noted that Cambridgeshire Horizons would like to 'sign up' to both the Cambridge Climate Change Charter and 10:10.

Discussion:

- Noted that CCC supports any and all efficiencies to reduce carbon. It had set itself more stringent targets than those posed under the 10:10 challenge, a 6% reduction each and every year, so had not signed up to this;
- Horizons as an entity wished to 'do its bit';
- Public buildings were old and would be costly to make more efficient;

Agreed:

- Horizons to sign up to the Cambridge Climate Change Charter;
- Horizons will 'bank' the 10:10 challenge and sign up to it. The Chairman asked JT if she would send him the detail of CCC's commitment to more stringent demands.

JT/ML

d)

Cambridgeshire Quality Panel:

JO gave a verbal update. An Appointments Panel had met two weeks ago, involving a representative from each authority, and selected the members of the Quality Panel from the 52 applicants. A full list will be circulated to all Board members by email. The Introductory meeting of this Panel has been scheduled in order for the Panel members to familiarize themselves with the Quality Charter and to tour some strategic sites in Cambridgeshire.

Discussion:

Queried as to the applicants' experience? JO noted that a range of expertise was required on the panel, across the Quality Charter 4 'C's, and that from the list of 52 very strong applicants it would have been possible to appoint at least 30, but it had to be whittled down to 12. With some living in rural communities, some urban, not just designers but with an understanding of community, low carbon, access and sustainability issues.

**13. Protocol for commissioning and governance of new projects**

AP's report had been circulated. He noted that guidance was required regarding evidence based work and where Horizons stands on being involved. This had been brought to light through the work on the Green Infrastructure Review and needed clarification. Interaction between Horizons processes and those of each local authority member approval processes needed to be defined clearly. It was therefore suggested that each Main Board meeting would receive a 'Project Overview'.

Within Horizons' Business Plan 2008/11, workstreams were identified, but it was also now intended to refine these on an annual basis.

Finally, all Board papers would be more clearly marked, in future, as For

Information Only, For Discussion/Steer or For Approval.

Discussion:

- Concerns regarding the GI Review consultation process noted;
- Suggestion that 'For Approval' should be changed to 'For Decision';

Agreed:

- Quarterly Project Overview agreed;
- Annual refined Business Plan agreed;
- Board papers to be marked – For Information Only, or For Discussion/Steer, or For Decision.

**GDB**

**14. HCA's Review of local delivery vehicles – outline of response**

AP's report with appendix outline of response had been circulated. Both SDT and AP explained the history behind this. Noted also was that EEDA were currently also conducting an LDV Review (mainly focused on LDVs funded by them, which does not include Horizons). The HCA Review has now been delayed until after the election. The outline circulated is very much a first draft.

Discussion:

- Noted that the GCP currently has remit for economic development, so wording in last sentence needs to clarify this;
- Noted that with future funding being very difficult, there was a need to be open minded about tightening budgets and how we could all operate more efficiently;
- Whoever is elected there will be cuts in public spending and some very hard decisions to make, not only within partnerships, but with the public;
- A need to respond to the comments made by Shelter and Centre for Cities regarding the lack of delivery of homes in Cambridgeshire, to give the right reasons and to show the work that **is** being completed.

Agreed:

Document is a good starting point.

**15. Forward Planner**

Dates for future meetings to be circulated to the three new Board members.

**16. Any Other Business**

SDT noted that this was JO's last meeting prior to his one-year secondment to CCC as Acting Executive Director of Environment. JO has been with Horizons since 2004. SDT was sure everyone would join him in wishing JO every success in his new post.

JO's replacement, John Williamson, from Go-East, used to be a Horizons Board member, so will be known to most members. He starts on 6<sup>th</sup> April for 12 months.

Horizons Conference is confirmed as taking place on 10<sup>th</sup> June in Ely, at the Maltings. The principle speaker has been confirmed as the HCA Chairman, Robert Napier.

**17. Date of the next meeting**

1<sup>st</sup> July, 2010, 1000 at The Council Chamber, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Nutholt Lane, Ely, Cambs.

The meeting closed at 1255.