

**Cambridgeshire Horizons Board
Minutes from the Meeting held on
Thursday 1st July, 2010
The Council Chamber, East Cambridgeshire District Council Offices,
Nutholt Lane, Ely, Cambs**

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 Kit Owen (KO) sub	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
Paul Kitson (PK) (sub)	Homes & Communities Agency (HCA)
Steve Cox (SC)	EEDA
Professor Ian White	Cambridge University
Dr Paul Zollinger-Read	Cambridgeshire NHS
John Bridge (JB)	Cambridgeshire Chamber of Commerce

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Mark Lloyd (ML)	Company Secretary
Amy Richardson (AR) (sub)	Taylor Vinters
John Williamson (JW)	Cambridgeshire Horizons
Laura Halstead (LH)	Cambridgeshire Horizons
John Onslow (JO)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Katherine Brooks (KB)	Highways Agency
Peter Studdert (PS)	Director of Joint Planning
Anna Keyes (AK)	Cambridgeshire Horizons
Tim Wetherfield (TW)	Cambridge City Council
Gill Barker (Minutes) (GDB)	Cambridgeshire Horizons

APOLOGIES:

Steve Collins (SC)	Homes & Communities Agency (HCA) (sub)
Dr Gareth Goodier (GG)	Addenbrookes Hospital
Tim Freathy (TF)	GO - East
Cllr Alan Melton (AM)	Fenland District Council (sub)
Quentin Golder (QG)	Taylor Vinter (sub)

- 1. Welcome and Introductions**

SDT noted apologies as above. He welcomed Cllr Owen, attending for Cllr Melton, Paul Kitson, attending for Steve Collins and Amy Richardson who was attending for Quentin Golder.
Catherine Brookes of the Highways Agency was also present, substituting for Jamie Carr.
- 2. Declarations of Interest**

There were none declared.
- 3. Minutes of 25th March 2010 and Matters Arising**

The Minutes were noted and agreed.
Matters Arising: There were none which were not covered by the Agenda.
- 4. Minutes of the Audit & Risk Management (ARM) Committee of 4th June 2010**

The Minutes were noted. JB drew attention to the £62.5k deficit at the year end March 2010, covered by reserves. This was in line with Auditor recommendations for a reduction in reserves held. The full Annual Report and Financial statements would come to Board in due course.
Discussion:
It was queried when the membership of the ARM Committee came to Board for review. JB noted that this had occurred recently, on the retirement of Cllrs Nimmo-Smith and Moakes, and the Board had approved the new nominations. Other than on retirements from the Committee, membership could be queried or changed at the Annual General Meeting (AGM).
- 5. Minutes from the Joint Strategic Growth Implementation Committee Meetings of 20th April 2010**

The Minutes were noted.
- 6. Minutes from the Growth Partnership Board meeting of 9th June 2010**

The Minutes were noted.
AP drew attention to Item 6a) HGF Capital budget, and reported that a letter had been sent to Andrew Lansley MP, copied to local authority leaders, regarding potential threat of further cuts, seeking information urgently due to the many projects awaiting confirmation of this funding being secure. No reply received as yet.
- 7. Company Secretary's Report**

There was nothing to report at this time.
- 8. Protocol for the Commissioning and Governance of new projects**

- a) Work Programme 2010/11 - AP's report had been circulated. He noted that this issue had been to Board in the March meeting, with comments advising work was proceeding in the right direction, with refinements required. This paper tightened up the areas of concern and tried to show a balance between more detail yet not expecting the Board to micro-manage each project. Appendix 1:Item 3.1 sets out the main activities, with Appendix A showing timelines for major sites, and Appendix B listing Growth Projects and budgets. Appendix 3 then gives a project plan overview. JW noted that within Appx 3 Main Board milestones and timelines were listed. This will be updated as projects move on. This will give Board an overview of HGF project funding. It also gives more detail on the individual project including those that require countywide consultation.

Discussion:

- Noted overall that this report was very helpful;
- Query whether the governance issue still required more work, in particular was there enough liaison with local authority officers. Noted that all the information contained within the paper was shared with both Growth Partnership Board (officers from all 6 local authorities) and Senior Officer Board (officers from CCC, City and SCDC).
- Queried in return whether GPB and SOB were the right forums;
- Noted that Main Board should take a strategic stance;
- Query why papers were now marked for 'decision' and not 'approval'; noted that the last Board meeting had agreed that 'decision' was better;
- Noted that this 'work programme' would be best placed to come to Board each December, showing plans for coming year. This was noted for the future.

Agreed:

- This programme to be updated and returned to Main Board each meeting as a standing item;
- That Growth Partnership Board and Senior Officer Board were the correct fora for the Work Programme papers to be discussed by local authority officers.
- There would be no re-organisation of process beyond the above, until post March 2011.

- b) Community Engagement: - LH's paper had been circulated. She drew attention to the four recommendations for future focus of work.

Discussion:

- Noted that the principle was a sound one, assuming that best use was made of all existing groups and arrangements;
- Query which budget this work would be costed to. Noted that it was primarily a time and expertise cost;
- Noted that there should be cross-working with neighbouring authorities;
- Reported that this strategy, and some single site strategies are best delivered at the micro level and, therefore, fronted by local authorities;
- Noted that much work is already proceeding, in particular through the partnership Communications Group, of which LH is a member;
- Reported that the developers for the University, north west site were advertising a 'consultation' and noted that this would be developer led. Integrated consultation would be preferable.

Further noted that the University itself, and the staff had also yet to be 'consulted'. Engagement was multi-faceted.

Agreed:

Horizons to focus its community engagement work, in partnership with the local authorities, on creating and delivering major growth site engagement plans. Including specifically:

- Helping to draft community engagement strategies with the local authorities;
- Helping to organise community forums;
- Delivering a renewable energy awareness raising campaign;
- Continuing other community engagement via online and PR means.

c)

Renewable Energy Strategy: - LH's paper had been circulated. The main points were:

ERDF match funding helped to create the LCDI, bringing together the two elements with Renewables East and partners, involving the Climate Change Partnership and the Environmental Sustainability Partnership.

A Renewable Energy Awareness campaign should assist in raising the profile and dispelling myths surrounding elements such as Combined Heat and Power (CHP).

Discussion:

- Query as to budget for this work. Noted mainly staff time, plus £2.5k from Horizons Communications budget;
- Query whether there was duplication in work being carried out by Renewables East. Noted that it was complimentary work;
- Work to be carried out by March 2011;
- Noted that retro-fitting of existing buildings equally important;
- Noted that all budgets were agreed prior to HGF Capital budget cut and query whether all budgets should be revisited as a result;
- Noted that if the bulk of this funding was from outside sources, then the opportunity to complete the work at minimal cost should be taken.

Agreed:

The delivery of a renewable energy awareness raising campaign including retrofitting within the scope of the work.

9. HGF

a) Revenue Programme and Budget:

AP reported that this budget had been delayed due to consideration of new projects to utilise the forecast underspend. The original project list, plus the proposals for new projects had been to both Growth Partnership Board (GPB) and Audit & Risk Management (ARM) for approval and onward recommendation to this meeting.

JW then gave an overview of the Revenue budget to date noting that its primary application was to support HGF capital projects. He outlined the £460K of new projects, noting these as having scored the highest against criteria laid down by GPB. Finally, JW outlined the proposal for a 'loan' of up to £180,000 from the funding allocation agreed for Northstowe to the Uttons Drove Land Drainage Solution to support its delivery. This money will return within the lifespan of the budget.

Discussion:

- Query regarding the Uttons Drove project and its relationship to Cambourne. Noted that this project was different entirely from the current foul sewage problem being experienced by Cambourne

- which was being dealt with by Anglian Water;
- Query regarding security for the loan proposal. Noted very secure;
- Query regarding the March Transport Study cost. Noted that bulk of cost was consultancy, but there was a need for an infrastructure study to accompany the new plans;
- Noted that in the absence of the RSS, there now had to be a 'in principle' agreement from all local authorities to co-ordinate strategic planning for the County;
- Query whether the £50k toward the Cambridgeshire Transport Capacity Study was correct. JW to investigate and report back.

JW

Agreed:

- Noted the current HGF Revenue budget expenditure to end of Quarter 4, 2009/10;
- The final HGF Revenue Budget for 2009/11, including proposed new projects as listed at 4.2 (a) in the paper, as recommended by both Growth Partnership Board and Audit and Risk Management Committee;
- That up to £180,000 from the funding allocation agreed for Northstowe in March 2010 is able to be loaned to the Uttons Drove Land Drainage Solution to support its delivery. The return of loan to be within the budget timetable.

Capital Programme 2009-2011 – Review of Progress:

b)

JW's report had been circulated. The main points:

- £7.7m of this years funding still to be confirmed;
- Under 2.1 – noted that there had been £3m of the £21m spent with £15m committed. This reflects the long term nature of the projects;
- Under 4.0 – highlights projects which will now be under threat should any additional funding cuts occur.

Discussion:

All noted.

c)

Budget Implications:

Discussion:

General discussion regarding budget timetables for the future. Members also asked which elements of Horizons revenue budgets could be reconsidered in light of loss of Housing and Planning Delivery Grant (HPDG) and the implications of this. Noted that, for example, next financial year's budget should look to come to Board in December, two months after the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR).

Agreed:

Revenue budgets to be reviewed at September Board to identify best use of resources for Cambridgeshire in light of HPDG funding sources.

Agenda

10.

Progress Report

a)

Partnership Review:

SDT drew attention to a letter received from Vince Cable and Eric Pickles, copies of which were circulated at the meeting. In particular he noted the last paragraph which was seeking proposals for Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) by 6th September. This time scale was extremely tight.

ML also circulated a written report. He noted that the implications in the letter from Government for organizations such as Horizons, Cambridgeshire Together, Greater Cambridge Partnership and EEDA were evident. The letter was clear about the functionality of any LEP but had no information regarding future financial proposals. JT and ML had queried possible financing, to be advised there would be no information on this until after the CSR.

ML further noted that in May, 2010, Cambridgeshire Together had triggered a 'partnership review', work on which was ongoing, so this area was well placed to have a proposal ready within the timescale of 52 days. A Project Board was to be set up to include local authority leaders and businesses, with Terms of Reference being agreed. The geographical area had yet to be agreed/defined, but the letter clearly stated 'two or more "higher tier" authorities'. One option could be Cambridgeshire and Peterborough for example.

Discussion:

- Noted that EEDA was willing to assist with this work. A government white paper is currently being prepared. The mechanisms of the proposal will be crucial;
- Principles are sound, with the new deadline just requiring a quickening of pace. The lead officers on this should include a rural CEO – John Hill?;
- Travel to Work areas will be crucial in deciding which authorities should join together. Letter makes it obvious that economic issues more important than geographical boundaries;
- Discussions not just with local authorities, but also local business partners, using Chamber of Commerce and local CBI etc.;
- Most important to move forward, in agreement, quickly and together otherwise we may miss the boat!
- ML to issue a timetable for ensuring compliance.

ML

b)

Update on Housing targets:

SBee's paper had been circulated. JW drew attention to the main points: Provisional figures for housing completions last year at 2121; Exceeded the LAA and RSS targets;

Agreed:

All noted.

c)

Major developments and infrastructure:

JW's report on the progress for Major Development Sites and infrastructure had been circulated.

The content was noted with no queries.

SDT introduced Catherine Brookes from the Highways Agency, standing in for Jamie Carr.

CB reported that the Highways Agency had also been advised of funding cuts - £37m initially with a further £31m most recently, out of a total £1.1b budget. Could be further cuts following the CSR in Autumn, so no decision can be made until beyond that date, so schemes which involve public enquiries have had to be postponed until situation is clearer. Each scheme will then be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. It is unclear what the Highways role will be following these cuts.

Discussion:

- Noted that many sites were affected by the recent decision regarding the A14 upgrade – Northstowe, NIAB Extra, Cambridge University.
- Noted also that whilst the upgrade in general was necessary, the Huntingdon Viaduct was critical. Noted that the Viaduct was being looked at separately due to the safety issues;
- Query whether the whole A14 situation could not be looked at piecemeal;
- Noted that there had been European funding available for the A14

but was not used for the 'worst' area as it was deemed that the Highways Agency would invest in this 'bit'. The alternative road for use in emergencies is the A428, yet the only piece of this road which would be used at these times is the only piece not currently dualled;

- CB reported that the Highways Agency bid to the CSR was not reduced from its original bid for funding, as all schemes are too important;
- Noted that the Huntingdon Viaduct was definitely No. 1 on list of priorities;
- Query whether a toll road would fulfill requirements. Noted that private investment initiatives could be considered. The HA's own Road Intelligence Unit reported on timing delays when diversions in place;

Agreed:

That a specific item for Highway matters would be added to the Agenda and that a written brief/paper would be welcome from the Highways Agency.

Agenda

11. Investment Package Update

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

AP's report on the progress regarding the above had been circulated, along with an updated copy of the LIP. He noted that this document was still required to progress through each local authorities own processes and then return to Board in September. Then to progress through the HCA's own internal processes, with the aim being to conclude with a formal Local Investment Agreement by March 2011.

Agenda

b)

Community Infrastructure Levy(CIL)/Tariff/Tax Increment Finance (TIF) update:

AP noted that CIL was 'still alive' under the new coalition government, currently being on the statute books, so could be utilized. TIF is a capital funding mechanism which could support growth arrangements in the future. There have been encouraging signs from government.

Discussion:

- Concern that the LIP document was already out of date due to the rapidly changing political arrangements;
- Query regarding employment statistics in the document, in particular those identified as City and those as South Cambs. Needs to take into account area such as Cambridge Science Park. Noted currently being investigated in order to show a collective such as Cambridge economic area or Cambridge sub-region;
- Noted that previous paper set a timetable for Northstowe. Is the HCA definitely funding this project? PK noted that some investment plans have been signed off. This year's funding could see £700k reduction which would affect the allocation of monies to the 'single conversation'. Investment Plan should be completed by September.

Agreed:

Content of report noted.

12. Quality Panel Update – including Terms of Reference

The paper noting the Quality Panel membership and the Terms of Reference had been circulated and the content noted.

13. Delivering Low Carbon Infrastructure

SF's report had been circulated. She then gave a presentation the main points of which were:

- A summary of the key issues affecting the delivery of low carbon infrastructure, noting a Zero Carbon rating by 2016;
- The proposed work programme for decarbonising new buildings;
- Progress on the Carbon Offset Fund (COF) including information on Allowable Solutions, the Low Carbon Development Initiative (LCDI), Renewable Energy Infrastructure Plan (REIP) and Cost Benefit Analysis for new Public Buildings (CBA), and;
- Explained how these projects fit together;
- Noting that a Carbon Offset Fund Briefing was currently being organized for members;
- Forward Plan showing infrastructure planning and governance arrangements to come to September Board

Agenda

Discussion:

- The recommendations from the paper were discussed. It was noted that the LCDI offered a good opportunity to support an energy scheme in Cambridge City Centre, the heart of the growth area, and that the LCDI could support its development;
- Concern was raised due to the funding arrangements for this work. This was noted as £100k overall. ERDF match funding was noted.

Agreed:

- That Horizons should seek to influence the definition of 'Allowable Solutions' for low carbon development so that it includes contributions to local carbon offset funds, and investment in retrofit projects for existing buildings;
- That the Cambridge City/ARU Energy Project and St.Neots Renewable Energy Project should join the Low Carbon Development Initiative (LCDI);
- That Horizons coordinates work on a Renewable Energy Infrastructure Plan (REIP);
- Noted the progress on the four low carbon projects described and their interrelationship.

14. Green Infrastructure Review

SF's paper had been circulated. The report updated the Board on progress with the Green Infrastructure Review, the 2nd draft of which should be ready early September 2010 for Local Authorities to consider through formal member processes during September – November 2010. It also identified key issues arising through the Review process.

Discussion:

Budgets were noted. It was queried whether £20k to deliver Green Infrastructure Area Frameworks was really necessary. Noted that overall, a clear evidence base to support future planning arrangements was required, involving all sites, and that the GI Review was important to support the plan making process.

Agreed:

- Progress noted;
- The partnership approach and timetable were agreed;
- The funding of the five area frameworks is to be deferred (to be reviewed as part of wider discussions on Growth Funding).

15. Forward Planner

The Forward Planner had been circulated. The timing of the September

Board meeting was discussed and it was agreed this meeting would commence at 1030, instead of 1000.

16. Any Other Business

- 17.** Date of the next meeting was confirmed as 1030 on 29th September 2010 at the Swansley Rooms, South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne.

IB then moved that the final item be held in closed session due to the confidential nature of the issue. This was agreed by the meeting.

The meeting closed at 1255.