

Growth Partnership Board Meeting
2nd September 2009
The Boathouse, Wisbech
1430-1600

BOARD MEMBERS:

Name	Authority
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
Rebecca Yee	Fenland District Council

APOLOGIES:

Steve Hampson	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Laura Halstead	Cambridgeshire Horizons
Geoff Bruce	Cambridgeshire Horizons

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Name	
Tom Read (Item 8d)	Cambridgeshire Horizons
David Bethell (Item 8c)	Cambridgeshire Horizons
Minutes	
Gill Barker	Cambridgeshire Horizons

Actions

- 1. Tour of Facility**
GG welcomed everyone to The Bouthouse Centre, gave a brief overview of the new facility, its funding, organisation and current usage, and gave the attendees a tour.

- 2. Welcome and Apologies**
AP welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted the apologies as above.

- 3. Minutes of the Meetings held on 9th June and 29th July, 2009 and Matters Arising**

Both sets of Minutes were agreed. Matters arising from 9th June:

Item 3 – The Hive Project - Ongoing;

Item 5 – HGF Capital Programme – will be covered under this Agenda;

Item 6 – HGF Revenue – also on this Agenda;

Item 8 – Implementation Plans (IDP, VRT and CIL): AP noted that a Steering Group is taking these projects through, with timetable for a decision from Horizons Main Board in December 2009.

Discussion:

Necessity to ensure each of the six local authorities were organising their own internal processes to enable timetable to work;

Endorsement processes examined;

Agreed:

Each local authority to take the IDP/VRT/CIL through internal processes for endorsement between 24th September and 10th December, to enable Horizons Main Board to sign off in December 2009.

All

- 4. Programme and Key Issues**

Strategic Risk Register:

The refreshed SRR had been circulated. JO drew attention to the issue regarding the dynamics of this document, whilst updated regularly it would never be perfect. The current edition required input from East Cambs/Hunts and Fenland DC's. JO then noted that JSGIC required this document, which placed it in the public domain, albeit a redacted version. GB will be organising a further Sub/Sob group meeting to finalise this for JSGIC. It will remain a background paper to Main Board.

GB

JO was seeking a decision regarding the Recommendations in the report, in particular the Options relating to presentation of the SRR for Member meetings. He reported that Senior Officer Board (SOB) had reviewed it at their last meeting, and from the Options provided had chosen 2.3.1 with a cover sheet showing that it was a collaborative document and the date it was updated. SOB had also recommended the use of an Exception Report.

JO also reported that Horizons Audit & Risk Management Committee will be reviewing this document.

Discussion:

- There was broad agreement in principle for this document to be within the public domain, noting that as a 'strategic' document, it required little redacting;
- The cycle of the document, and the resources required to achieve this, was noted. It was therefore considered that a quarterly cycle, in line with Horizons Main Board would be sufficient;
- The use of an Exception Report would be extremely useful. This should highlight any major changes with the SRR, along the lines of that shown at Appx. C;

- Both SRR and proposed Exception Report would require circulation to senior officers prior to Main Board, and GPB. The quarterly cycle should therefore precede the dates of these meetings by two weeks, to allow enough time for comments etc;

Agreed:

- SRR, as circulated to this meeting, with the addition of a cover page showing all authorities and dated, to continue;
- Circulation, on a quarterly basis in line with GPB and Main Board, should be two weeks prior to each GPB meeting;
- Should include an Exception Report noting any major changes, in the style of Appx C.

5. **Cambridgeshire Together Report**

JO noted that Horizons Main Board were responsible for the Growth theme.

LAA

Within the 35 Key Target areas which the LAA had chosen, there were a number of Red Flag indicators, one being NI154 – Number of Homes Delivered. Discussions were ongoing with the Audit Commission, in light of the current economic climate, to try to reduce the original targets, and any target failure will be judged against both a national and local framework. The Cambridgeshire Together Board meeting on 22nd September will hear all current mitigations for red flag indicators. The proposed raid on the HGF Capital programme will not help, and targets need to be renegotiated. JO is currently drafting the CT Board and Horizons Main Board report, should attendees have any comments.

CAA

The Comprehensive Area Assessment is ongoing with results known in November. Work is continuing through CELG and the 'Making Cambridgeshire Count' initiative. They are currently undertaking a revision of the best use of resources in Cambridgeshire. This group will then advise Horizons Main Board.

Discussion:

Noted that the Audit Commission had intimated that on performance judged to date, a possible green flag could be awarded overall.

6. **HGF Capital programme**

JO noted no update from government as yet regarding the proposal to cut funding by £6m. Consultation was due to commence this month, and work was currently focusing on 'worst case scenario'. This was complex work due to key projects at critical stages.

Trumpington Meadows - almost there;

Clay Farm – still potential for a deal but preparing for a Public Enquiry. CPL's case based on viability. Require Founder Members steer on different way forward in light of all possible scenarios.

Discussion:

Should Clay Farm go to appeal, success was very important in order to set the principle for future applications;

Should appeal fail, there was still potential for use of HGF Flexible Fund;

Kickstart2 funding could also be a possibility, this will be shown to the Inspectorate at Appeal;

Appeal will commence 28th September and last two weeks, with decision expected by Christmas. However, some appeals have two rounds which

will then delay result;

Requirement to time prioritise all projects. 5.3 in report starts this process, with 5.4 and 5.5 showing projects less time critical. Some cannot await the outcome of this appeal to commence, and some can still deliver subsequently. However, not enough funds for all of the original list of projects if government funding cuts occur;

Appendix C should be redrafted and shown in table format, with comments regarding deliverability, match funding etc. included;

Noted that negotiations are already ongoing in some projects originally listed for funding. These require sensitive handling;

Should appeal not conclude until post Christmas, and results of any government funding cut not know for sure until the same period, this would result in decision from March 2010 Board, which would be too late, with a danger of existing projects stalling beyond a deliverable timeframe;

Concerns noted regarding possible HGF for future rounds if delayed decision making meant full spend not achieved within the timescales;

Discussion regarding timeframe of returns and usage of same with regard the proposed loan/equity funding;

Query whether list of projects as a whole required re-assessment, due to potential £6m funding cut;

Appendix C was then discussed in some detail, to assist with information in report to both Founder Members and Main Board;

Agreed:

September Main Board to be advised and asked to approve a 'worst case scenario' programme, should the threatened full £6m cut proceed;

Founder Members meeting to be organised to be advised on all other possible scenarios and to prioritise all projects based on information known at that time. Information to include deliverability, timescales, possible delays;

JO to organise circulation of updated Appendix C prior to both meetings.

GDB

JO

7. HGF Revenue Budget

SF's report had been circulated previously. Progress was noted.

Discussion:

Noted that HPDG gave each authority an opportunity to have an effect;

A feasibility study into multi-storey primary schools would require £5k.

Agreed:

The feasibility study for multi-storey primary schools to proceed at a cost of £5k;

To recommend that the Main Board endorse the HGF Revenue Budget as presented, with GPB continuing to monitor.

8. Quality of Life

a) Delivering Zero Carbon New Public Buildings

SF's paper had been circulated. AP drew attention to points: all new non-domestic buildings, such as schools needed to comply by 2016, with all other public buildings by 2019. Report set out a proposal to comply earlier still in an effort to avoid the cost of 'carbon permits'.

Discussion:

Noted that the author of the report, Sheryl French, was currently away from work ill;

Query whether consultation with CCC and/or SCDC relevant officers had taken place, such as Julia Barrett and John King;

Combined comments would be required by the Environmental Sustainability Partnership.

Agreed:

Report would be held back from JSGIC, depending upon results of consultation with other authority lead officers, but may yet proceed to Main Board.

8 b) Renewable Energy

SF's report had been circulated previously. JO noted that these projects were funded by HGF Revenue budget. Projects at stage where further prioritisation was now required.

Discussion:

The four elements were discussed - a) North West Cambridge – ongoing; b) Public Buildings – ongoing; c) Developing a model masterplan; d) Develop proposals for a 'sub regional carbon offset mechanism'.

Projects a and b were ongoing, and c will not be required until a and b are complete;

The above will have input into Design Codes;

Noted that Hunts will be producing a 'master-plan' of its own.

Agreed:

Recommend to Main Board that Project d) Develop proposals for a 'sub regional carbon offset mechanism' be prioritised.

8. c) Green Infrastructure Review and Public Consultation

DB's report had been circulated previously. This gave an update since the March presentation. The Review was now at a key stage across the whole of Cambridgeshire as it goes out for Public Consultation. All 6 local authorities are involved.

Agreed:

The meeting supported the public consultation process for the GI Review with no additional comments.

8 d) Water Cycle Strategy

TR's report had been circulated previously. TR noted the three Water Cycle Strategies currently being developed across Cambridgeshire and drew attention to two main issues: a) immediate requirement for consultancy work to capture effectiveness, and b) consideration of how best to engage with Members and senior officers.

Discussion:

The Pitt Review could assist, CCC currently working on this and is involved;

Query whether this work will feed into the IDP update? Noted that it would, requiring codes, criteria and definitions in order to fully inform and involve members;

TR noted detail of those codes and agreed to ensure inclusion.

8 e) Delivering Major Cultural Facilities

JO/LP's report had been circulated previously. This report would not go through to Main Board at this stage, but was for GPB's information only. He drew attention to the Outcomes noted within the report and noted the problems that have been involved. He briefly outlined the Action Plan attached.

Discussion:

Query whether Making Cambridgeshire Count could assist with this project, by focusing on one place and linking across;

Agreed:

Report noted.

8 f) Cambridgeshire Quality Panel

PS's report had been circulated previously. PS noted that this was a proposal for a small Panel, meeting 3 or 4 times a year, just to look at the large planning applications. He expected in the region of 300 applications from suitably qualified panellists.

9. Investment Package - Update

AP noted that the IDP had already been discussed under Item 3.

VRT/CIL was being carried forward through a Steering Group. Government proposal on CIL legislation was currently out for public consultation with a decision in Spring 2010. He noted that the plan was to be ready for as an early CIL area which could then work back on VRT if CIL does not come through. Hunts DC will be the pilot area for CIL. This will require a revised 505.

Discussion:

Query whether the whole county could be ready to go along with Hunts?

AP noted that would require readiness by March 2010 and some authorities would not make this deadline;

Hunts DC to 'blaze the trail' all others could then follow. ECDC may seek to advance to fit with Hunts timelines;

Concerns that Fenland may fall behind due to problems with 'Shape Fenland' consultations;

SCDC/City/Fenland to talk off line with a view to proceeding together through consultation process.

10. Review of draft Main Board Agenda

Current draft noted to include:

Item 8 c - Kickstart Programme to include detail on letter sent to HCA

Item 9 – Co-ordinating Economic Downturn Plans – AP noted this was a request of CPSB;

Item 12 f and g – additions of Green Infrastructure Review and Cambridgeshire Quality Panel;

Item 8 – New – HGF cuts

11. Forward Planner – Meeting dates

This was noted. Any suggested items to be forwarded to GDB.

12. Any other Business

There was none.

The meeting closed at 1720.

The next meeting will take place on 18th November, 1400 at The Council Chamber, Ely