

**Growth Partnership Board Meeting
9th September 2010
Committee Room 1, The Guildhall, Cambridge**

Growth Partnership Board Members Present:

Name	Authority
Alex Plant	Cambridgeshire Horizons
John Williamson	Cambridgeshire Horizons
Simon Payne	Cambridge City Council
Graham Hughes	Cambridgeshire County Council
John Onslow	Cambridgeshire County Council
Jo Mills	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Malcolm Sharp	Huntingdonshire District Council
Gary Garford	Fenland District Council
Giles Hughes	East Cambridgeshire District Council
Peter Studdert	Joint Planning Director

Additional Attendee(s)/Substitutes:

Geoff Bruce	Cambridgeshire Horizons
Sheryl French	Cambridgeshire Horizons
Janine Starling (Item 3 only)	Peterborough Environment City Trust
Sandy Shattock (Item 3 only)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Judit Gorog	Cambridgeshire Horizons

Minutes:

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

Apologies:

Laura Halstead	Cambridgeshire Horizons
Steve Hampson	South Cambridgeshire District Council

Actions

1. Welcome and Apologies

AP welcomed all attending and reported the apologies noted above.

2. Minutes of the Meeting held on 9th June 2010 and matters arising.

The Minutes were agreed.

Matters arising:

Under Item 2: JO noted that further to the concern expressed at the Cambridgeshire Together Board, regarding the scrapping of RSS targets and the CT Board noting the need for a clear and coherent countywide strategy along the CRESM model, a draft was currently being circulated among local authorities to ensure that this could be utilised as a robust evidence base for the future;

Under Item 7: Quality Panel – JW reported that regarding FOI it had been agreed to follow the CAGE model whereby pre-application reviews were treated as confidential, for commercial reasons. Post application, normal FOI rules apply. Further noted that with developer agreement, QP reviews could be released earlier.

3. Influencing behavioural change in New Communities

JW introduced Janine Starling (JS) from the Peterborough Environment City Trust (PECT). PECT had conducted 1,000 face to face interviews with householders around Hampton, a suburb of Peterborough now about 10 years old to explore how environmentally beneficial behavioural changes might be made in communities.

- Interviews focussed on 'break points' in lives, e.g., moving house, birth of children;
- Community events supported the surveys and contributed to community cohesion;
- In following up 12 months later, every person interviewed had made one or more lifestyle change:
 - 33% more wildlife friendly gardening
 - 25% use eco-friendly cleaning products
 - 27% reduced waste
 - 47% re-use shopping bags
 - 39% started growing produce
 - 32% use cars less
- Some changes in more deprived areas were made to save money, but some in more prosperous areas were for environmental reasons;
- Phase 3 of survey starts in October using different interview process, moving with the times, possible personalising of 'goody bags'.

Discussion:

- General agreement that the work that PECT had carried out gave valuable learning experience which could be utilised elsewhere;
- Query whether survey results available? Noted that the survey report would be available shortly. To be circulated to GPB;
- Query whether age differences had been identified? JS reported that throughout the 1,200 surveys, both age and location had been identified;
- Query whether now, with experience, PECT would do anything differently?
- JS noted that they would tailor the information in the 'goody bags' and have more contact by survey throughout the programme;

GDB

- Noted that 'behavioural change' is best affected right from the beginning, and that to have the developers on board in the early stages would be beneficial;
- Currently, Community Development Officers visit all new residents. Orchard Park had been a learning experience locally, and should be borne in mind for Northstowe. Requests had been received for allotments. Were these being built in for Southern Fringe? How to deal with the impact on density issues?
- Showhouses should be used as demonstration;
- Use of Eco Champions in each development;

AP thanked JS for her efforts.

4 Major Sites Programme and Key Issues

JW's report had been circulated. Main Points:

- Noted that full and outline planning permissions were now coming through on sites, such as Southern Fringe, Orchard Park and NIAB;
- The Clay Farm equity deal was also nearing completion with CFO's from City, County and SCDC now dealing with the legal agreement which will go to Horizons Main Board for approval;
- NWest Retail Study was now available;
- Uttons Drove funding now secure;
- St Neots Delivery Board fully engaged with developers;
- Northstowe later on the Agenda.

Discussion:

- Cambridgeshire's Quality Panel (QP) meeting shortly to review St Neots scheme. Noted that this was why funding for the QP needed to continue. Esther Cooke currently drawing up the work programme for the Panel The St Neots scheme was linked with LCDI for renewable energy;
- Full SRR goes to Audit & Risk (ARM) meeting;
- From the 1-pager updates it was noted that:
 - HTC – Now seems likely that CPO unnecessary, and that full HGF will be required;
 - Clay Farm – decision on spine road now technically approved, with written confirmation awaited;
 - Noted that development locally is stronger than national trend with 5.5k houses with planning permission.

5. HGF Capital and Revenue Budgets:

a) Capital and Revenue budgets:

JW's report had been circulated. Main points:

- Capital: This year's £7.8m allocation had now been received. Of the £22m over the 2009/11 funding period, £17m had either been spent or was committed, and there was a total overprofile of 4.8%;
- Three schemes highlighted as risk to spend during timescale. Further updates on these now confirmed the following:
 - Hunts TC – No CPO now required, funding should be used within timescales;
 - Cambridge Gateway – should now complete within timescale;
 - N/S Cycle Routes – Risk should go from 'red' to 'amber' as now more likely that project will complete;

- Revenue: All £1.7m of 2009/11 budget had been allocated, with the last Board meeting approving the final £380k to new projects;
- Three specific areas of recommendation required –
 - a) Retail Study £9k overspend due to additional work undertaken;
 - b) North West Transport Study £2k overspend, and
 - c) K1 (self-build) at Orchard Park - £20k Revenue funding to support.

Agreed:

Capital – Noted that three projects currently marked as ‘Red’ risk for spend in timescale should be adjusted, as all now likely to spend;

Revenue – Recommendation for a), b) and c) to approve overspends.

6. Wider Review of budgets for Horizons Board

JW’s report had been circulated. Main points:

AP noted that this report had been drawn up as a result of a request from Main Board to review Horizons HGF Revenue and Core budgets, and was for this meeting to make recommendations. It should be noted that up to £370K of potential savings could be made, to be used for either other work or for contingency planning;

JW then explained how the paper had identified the savings, with £200k firm and £93k possible;

Discussion:

- How the paper identified the HPDG shortfalls within each authority required more work. Each authority representative explained how the reduction in HPDG had affected them. Board paper to reflect this more fully;
- Individual reductions of budgets were examined and appraised;
- Possible future funding potential such as Regional Growth Fund and Housing Bonuses were discussed as well as the implications of no further HGF. Scenarios discussed;
- Noted that the Joint Planning Budget (JPB) may cease to exist. Implications discussed;
- Work on Pruning for Growth, including scenario planning, was discussed and noted that a further meeting was required to be arranged. JW to organise. Whilst this work would not deliver all the savings which will be required, it would assist enormously;

JW

Agreed:

- HPDG table in paper to be reworked in light of comments to this meeting;
- Reference to possible availability of future HGF Capital and Housing Bonus to be made in Board paper;
- All agreed that the continuation of collaborative working was essential, particularly in view of the recent LEP bid, and working toward a possible transition period;
- Letter from sub-region authorities regarding the JPB to be drafted and circulated by SP with a view to sending to Grant Shapps, copy to Henry Cleary, noting the effects should this funding not continue;
- Contingency plans to be drawn up for possible wind down of Horizons and/or transition into LEP;
- **With uncertainties surrounding the LEP, CSR and possible future funding decisions, the recommendation to Board was to be prudent and make no further spend with any savings until the**

SP

way forward was clearer.

7. Housing – draft outturn for 1st Quarter

Sue Beecroft's paper had been circulated. JW noted main points:
Total completions in the year to March 2010 was 2,166;
LAA target for 2009/10 exceeded but figure for 2010/11 was a challenge;
Discussion:
Breakdown of completion figures by district to be organised;
4.1 in paper requires changing to reflect tables in adopted plans.

SBee
SBee

8. Cambridgeshire Local Investment Plan (CLIP)

AP's report had been circulated. Main points:
Government now placing less emphasis on this work, but all local authorities have agreed work is worthwhile and worth continuing. Results will inform the LIA and therefore valuable for future funding bids such as RGF and Place Based budgets.

Discussion:
MS asked that the reference to Huntingdonshire's approach should be amended as it didn't accurately reflect the proper position.

SBee

9. Northstowe Update

SF reported that the joint promoters of Northstowe now seem to be earnestly moving this project forward, with an Options appraisal to go into CLG.
Eco Demonstrator project monies will be required;
Noted that the CEN was leading with an article stating Northstowe to go ahead.

10. Work programme

JW noted that this paper had been produced at Main Board request and queried if GPB had any further comments, particularly on the protocol for oversight of projects, which Main Board had referred back to GPB for consideration.

Discussion:
3.2 Protocol of project governance agreed;
Appx 1 – required one additional line for Orchard Park showing 220 houses to come.

JW

11. Renewable Energy Projects

a) Carbon Offset Fund Update

SF reported that the strategic, legal and financial options for this project were now being finalised. The Project Group were looking at the way forward. A Member Briefing had been held since the last GPB meeting at which was noted that members required more detail on some key issues and this would be provided in Phase 2;

Potential value of this fund is £100'sm and therefore very important;

Discussion:
No value in discussing dates just workstream;
Ensure that the approach is 'technology neutral' and focuses on the broader technical, policy and governance considerations.

Agreed:

All recommendations at 4.1. noted and with the removal of No. 1 in first bullet point, all were agreed.

b) Renewable Energy Infrastructure Plan (REIP now CRIF)

SF drew attention to the change of title for this work. It was now to be known as Cambridgeshire Renewable Infrastructure Framework (CRIF) and would involve electricity, heating and transport across Cambridgeshire and would consider community, commercial and Public Asset schemes; Growth in isolation does not work so it will also include existing stock and scoping work is underway;

Discussion:

- AP noted that the Project Group involving all authorities is very enthusiastic;
- Demand and capacity questions are uppermost;
- Representatives required for a Steering group.

12. LEP Update

AP reported that further to the Project Board's submission to government, both the Project Board and Cambridgeshire Public Service Board had asked AP to lead on the continuing work for this. He would now begin to draft out function, governance, transitional and funding scenarios. To assist with this he would be putting together a Team from across all authorities and businesses.

Discussion:

JO took the opportunity to thank all those who had supported and worked with the Project Board to enable the LEP submission to be made by due date; AP noted that the work of the Project Board may continue in one form or another, with an updated brief, and a steering group may also be required. Everyone will be kept updated with progress.

AP

13. Review draft Agenda for Board

Noted and agreed.

14. Forward Planner - 2010

Noted. Suggestion for an additional meeting late January. Agreed. GDB to organise.

GDB

15. Any other Business

Noted that PS will retire as Joint Planning Director at the end of March 2011.

16. Date of Next Meeting:

18th November, 2010 at 1400 at Kempen Room, The Maltings, Ely, Cambs