

**Joint Strategic Growth Implementation Committee Meeting**  
**15<sup>th</sup> July 2009**  
**Committee Room 1, The Guildhall, Cambridge**  
**1000-1200**

**Committee Members:**

**Name**

Sir David Trippier (SDT)	Cambridgeshire Horizons
Alex Plant (AP)	Cambridgeshire Horizons
John Onslow (JO)	Cambridgeshire Horizons
Cllr Dr David Bard (DB)	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Ray Manning (RM)	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Sebastian Kindersley (SK)	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Roy Pegram (RP)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Tony Orgee (TO)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Nichola Harrison (NH)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Sian Reid (SR)	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Ian Nimmo-Smith (INS)	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Lewis Herbert (LH)	Cambridge City Council

**APOLOGIES:**

Cllr Dr David Bard (DB)	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr Roy Pegram (RP)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Tony Orgee (TO)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Nichola Harrison (NH)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Lewis Herbert (LH)	Cambridge City Council
Brian Smith (BS)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Steve Hampson (SH)	South Cambridgeshire District Council

**SUBSTITUTES:**

Cllr John Reynolds	Cambridgeshire County Council
--------------------	-------------------------------

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

Graham Hughes (GH)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Simon Payne (SP)	Cambridge City Council
Peter Studdert (PS)	Joint Planning Director
Laura Halstead (LH)	Cambridgeshire Horizons
Jo Mills (JM)	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Tim Wetherfield (TW)	Cambridge City Council
Geoff Bruce	Cambridgeshire Horizons
Gill Barker (Minutes)	Cambridgeshire Horizons

## Actions

### 1. Welcome and Apologies

SDT welcomed all to the meeting and noted the apologies above.

### 2. Declarations of Interest

There were none.

### 3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> May 2009

The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed.

### 4. Matters Arising

Under Item 5: SDT noted that a meeting with all 6 LA Leaders had now taken place and the Notes of that meeting had been circulated. PS was to further work up the paper on a Quality Panel with all Directors of Planning and bring the subsequent paper back to Horizons Main Board.

Under Item 4: A query as to status of the Strategic Risk Register (SRR) and where any issue from it would be discussed. SDT noted that the SRR was a working dynamic document used by Officers. Prior to each meeting an Exception Report would be drawn from this document, highlighting all red risks, any significant change in risks and any changed mitigation which required reporting to members. Members would receive the SRR as background information, and if there was any issue within the SRR that was not highlighted on the Exception Report that members wished to raise, they should do so with SDT prior to the meeting.

#### Discussion:

The feasibility of operating two SRR's, one to exclude all commercially sensitive issues, which could then be in the public domain;

It was noted that this would be highly labour intensive, involving officers from all authorities, but particularly for Horizons.

#### Agreed:

To trial two versions of the SRR, one to exclude any commercially sensitive information for public consumption, alongside the Exception Report.

JO

### 5. Terms of Reference Review

The current ToR had been circulated. SDT advised that at the last Main Board meeting it had been suggested a review of the ToR for JSGIC should take place due to the change in geographical responsibility for Horizons to county wide.

#### Discussion:

- Suggested amendment under (ii) to read 'City and South Cambs' instead of 'each authority';
- Suggested amendment under (v) to read just 'The Chair';
- Other authority areas, and countywide issues to go through Growth

Partnership Board (GPB) to Main Board;

- Noted there would still be some crossover for border areas;
- Suggestion under (iii) – Bullet point 3 – this should show a link between JSGIC and the newly formed Section 29 Committee;
- Some concern regarding (iii) Bullet Points 4, 7, 8 and 9. Noted that the S.29 Committee will have clearly defined boundaries, with first meeting due early Autumn;
- Current S.101 Committee covers the NIAB Extra site and will be discussed later in the Agenda, with policy for this site having been set by the Inspector's report;
- Eastern area of North Fringe still requires considerable policy decisions;
- Further discussion on this to be taken off line.
- SDT then suggested a review of frequency of meetings. Current situation of 6 JSGIC and 4 Main Board per annum. Suggestion was for 5 and 5. This would allow alternate months for each, with August and December left clear.

Agreed:

- Under (ii) – change 'each authority' to 'in relation to the City and South Cambs areas with Horizons'...etc, but also to note the requirement, particularly in cross border areas for JSGIC **and** Countywide input;
- Under (iii) – Bullet Point 3 – to add 'and facilitate the work of the Section 29 Committee';
- Under (v) – remove the name (Sir David Trippier);
- The amended ToR to return to the next JSGIC meeting for approval;
- To leave JSGIC meeting frequency as scheduled for now.

**GDB**

**Agenda**

**6. Major Development Sites progress Report**

JO's paper had been circulated.

JR noted a non-prejudicial interest.

**a) General Overview:**

- Cambridge Southern Fringe (CSF):
- Trumpington Meadows – agreement in principle, with legal and S.106 matters almost at conclusion. Flexible Fund monies being used to deliver houses;
- Clay Farm being discussed under Part 2;
- Cambridge East – JSGIC members should be aware of Cambridge City Labour group letter to Marshalls seeking assurance Marshall would remain in Cambridge East;
- Northern Fringe East – planning policy work continuing;
- Work on Orchard Park, Cambourne and Northstowe noted;
- HGF Capital projects, in particular Green Infrastructure (GI) projects now have funding agreements signed off;
- HGF Revenue budgets managed by GPB on behalf of Main Board;
- Strategic Infrastructure work includes Water Cycle Strategies (WCS) and Renewable Energy Infrastructure Programme (REIP) work continuing.

Discussion:

- Concern noted regarding Cambridge East, and query as to where,

if not on Marshall land, all the new homes required within the government targets, could be built? Further noted that this would be debated by SCDC Cabinet tomorrow;

- SDT noted that this was a Delivery issue and therefore of considerable interest to this Committee;
- Noted that the Report showed considerable progress across a number of sites and issues. This should be celebrated, as it clearly showed cross authority partners working closely together;
- The updated SRR was a significant improvement. Possibility for an 'Opportunities Register' to show where mitigations have worked, turning Risks into Opportunities;
- Query regarding budgets managed by JSGIC. The Joint Planning Budget (JPB) is owned by JSGIC, who gives delegatory powers to Senior Officer Board (SOB) to allocate and monitor. This includes the S.29 Committee budget. Results of these delegatory powers to be reported to JSGIC.

**Agenda**

### **b) North West Cambridge**

JO's paper had been circulated.

#### Main Points:

- Delay in the NIAB frontage site;
- Policy position is becoming clearer, with the Inspectors Report in the EiP of the NW Area Action Plan due at the end of July, which will form the basis of delivery and concerns this Committee;
- Key cross-authority issues:
  - Water and Energy strategies and Environment Sustainability;
  - Green Infrastructure – transport needs buy-in;
  - S.106 – finalise issues including viability;
- All the above suggests a needs for a more orderly way to deal with these issues as they arise – suggest brain storming session;
- Outcomes very important – use of NWDB – which Horizons Chair.

**All**

#### Discussion:

- SDT noted a tabled paper regarding NWC – Transport Briefing Note from SR. An electronic copy to be sent out post-meeting.
- Key cross authority issues currently within the JPB were noted;
- Concerns raised regarding study requirements for CNW NIAB site, Retail Study ongoing, with a Transport Study requested to assist evaluation. Discussion in depth followed regarding policy, S101 and S.29 Committee involvement and the requirement for this study, resulting in agreement that any initial request should go through NWDB which would then filter through to SOB. Next SOB meeting due end of August;
- There should be further discussion off line between the relevant authorities to consider the policy framework surrounding Retail and Transport issues on this site.

**GDB**

**??**

### **6. Tax Increment Finance (TIF)**

AP's paper had been circulated.

#### Main Points:

This type of funding had not previously been allowed in the UK. The Chancellor's last Budget opened up the possibility and as a result Cambridgeshire has now bid to be part of any 'pilot' that the government may decide to try. The next stage is discussions with the CLG and

Treasury departments.

Discussion:

- AP was thanked for his work on this potential new source of funding;
- Query whether this was being proposed by current government and/or by the civil servants, and how any new government might view it. AP noted that if any new pilots were announced in the October pre-budget report then, theoretically any subsequent new government would be bound by the rules regarding this. However, it was considered that this idea of funding did fit in with current policy statements from the Conservative opposition;
- Would likely public expenditure cuts cause a problem? AP noted how a TIF worked and that, for a pilot, there was likely to be cap on potential funding, and it is critical to note that the Treasury is currently part of the decision-making process on TIF.

**7. Forward Planner**

Future Dates:

The meeting listed as 28<sup>th</sup> January 2010 would be required to be changed;

Agenda Planner:

Noted that the Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue and Cambridgeshire Police had been deferred until the September meeting.

**GDB**

**8. Any other Business**

SDT noted his thanks to INS for accompanying him to meet with Sarah Teather, Shadow Minister for Housing and reported a successful and pleasant meeting.

SDT had also met with Caroline Spelman, the Shadow Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, and had shared the results of both meetings with all local authority Leaders.

**9. Date of next meeting**

Wednesday 15<sup>th</sup> July, Committee Room 1, The Guildhall, Cambridge at 1000 am.

It was proposed by RM to hold Item 10 in 'closed' session due to the commercially sensitive nature of the issue. This was seconded by INS and agreed unanimously by the meeting.

Meeting closed at 11.40.