

Joint Strategic Growth Implementation Committee Meeting
11th February 2010
Room 128, Shire Hall, Cambridge

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:

John Onslow	Cambridgeshire Horizons
Cllr Lewis Herbert	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Sian Reid (sub)	Cambridge City Council

SUBSTITUTES:

Cllr Clare Blair (sub for SR)	Cambridge City Council
-------------------------------	------------------------

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Joseph Whelan (sub for GH)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Jo Mills	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Laura Halstead	Cambridgeshire Horizons
Tim Wetherfield (sub for SP)	Cambridge City Council
Julia Barrett (sub for BS)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Alison Mallows	Halcrows
Elliott Gill	Halcrows
Geoff Bruce (sub for JO)	Cambridgeshire Horizons
Gill Barker (Mins)	Cambridgeshire Horizons

Actions

1. **Welcome and Apologies**
SDT welcomed all to the meeting and noted the apologies and substitutes as listed above.
2. **Declarations of Interest**
SK – Item 8 – as a member of the Fire Authority
RP – Item 8 – as a member of the Fire Authority
3. **Minutes of the Meeting held on 4th November 2009**
RP noted under Item 6 – 2nd bullet point – should read Local Development Framework. Subject to this amendment, the minutes of the previous meeting were agreed.
4. **Matters Arising**
SDT noted regarding:
Item 3 – Brainstorming session – now superseded by time;
Item 7 – next JSGIC meeting on 20th April, no clash with JDCC.
5. **Major Development Sites progress Report**
With JO attending the All Parliamentary Cycle Club meeting this paper was led by AP.
Highlighted Points:
Section 1 – Overall Programme
Under 1.2 - Re-negotiating our LAA targets for housing delivery – AP noted that SB had worked closely with Mark Vigor at the County Council on this issue. Revised draft target figures of 3,011 from 3,839 were being circulated to Main Board, and through County Cabinet, before forwarding to Go-East.
Discussion:
 - Query regarding the figures shown for 2008/09? Noted there had been an ‘acceleration period’ during 09/10.
 - Noted the revised draft figures currently being circulated were a proposal at this stage, but were based on evidence suggesting a lower target was required.
 - Queried whether the £6m cut to Housing Growth Funds had been considered when reducing targets and whether this information was now in the public domain. Noted that the sensitivities surrounding this issue had diminished since the Government had officially notified that the cut would occur and that the resulting Project List, (post-cut), was made public by way of press release and was also available online. Other ways of publicising the results would be investigated. Further noted that the partnership had found ways to minimise the effects of the full £6m cut to funding, although this was still painful.
 - Query regarding effects on Flexible Fund for Glebe Farm. Noted that with the Trumpington Meadows project deal having been finalised, a letter had been sent to the Planning Enquiry regarding Clay/Glebe Farm saying that although there was still some funding potentially available for this project, due to the HGF funding cuts, it may now be less than originally offered. Meetings with both HCA and CPL still proceeding in effort to progress this project.

LH

Agreed:

AP to organise for the revised Housing target figures shown in the report table to be checked and re-circulated;

AP/SBee

Under 1.5.3. – TIF and the A14.

- Query whether a Plan 'B' was required in the event funding not forthcoming. Noted that this should be handled through the Joint Transport Forum (JTF) but that JSGIC could push as it affected implementation of growth, particularly for areas such as Northstowe. Current estimated cost of upgrade of A14 now put at £1.4b.
- Noted that the A14 was a Highways issue, and Main Board had been told by the HA that the A14 was 'top' of their list should monies be forthcoming.
- There was a need to focus on the Integrated Development Plan as a sub-regional infrastructure document. The A14 was a 'national' project. The City Council was unable to support the proposals for the A14 upgrade.

Under 1.5.4 – Multi-storey Schools – CCC had commissioned a consultancy team to look at this issue. An event being organised for late March was important to assist with understanding of this issue.

- Query whether JDCC members had been invited to this event. Noted and agreed that Julia Barrett of CCC, leading on this, should note.

GDB

Under 1.6 - Local Investment Plan for Cambridgeshire – AP noted that this work was being undertaken as part of the 'single conversation' with the HCA and at their request, using the IDP as an evidence base. It was in a very early draft stage, with AP working closely with Alan Carter as Chair of the Housing Board. This would result in a draft LIP going to Main Board through GPB. The timescale for a final document was much later in the year.

Under 1.8 - Resources – SOB was currently investigating the 'Pruning for Growth' issue, including looking at an internal consultancy model. This involved officers from CCC/City/SCDC and Horizons with the aim being to maximize the effectiveness and efficiency of cross-authority working, fewer resources, requiring greater levels of 'trust'.

Discussion:

- To be on the Forward Agenda plan for JSGIC;
- Noted that requirements for (1.6) LIP joint resources should also be clarified. The implications on deliverability due to the current financial climate;
- AP noted that the focus was on capital yet the revenue side was critical. HCA currently seeking views on value of LDVs in light of their own expected funding cuts. Main Board will oversee the response.

GDB

Section 2 – Summary of Progress with Major Development Sites

Overview:

SDT reported on a meeting with Lord Smith, Chair of the EA at which the he had been very appreciative of the way in which this partnership is working together. He had stressed the importance of this. Also the importance of Uttons Drove to Northstowe had been shown to be vital.

Under 2.2.3 - North West Cambridge Area Action Plan – main issue at present is ‘key worker’ housing.

Discussion:

- Noted that the Joint Planning Team(JPT) letter to the developers was very good,
- But governance issues need to be covered There was concern that no deal had yet been struck with Barratt’s. It was reported that there was support from Grosvenor regarding the issue with Barratt’s. It was queried whether Grosvenor should be encouraged to pursue a new partner?
- Noted that all discussions were now through the JPT so they need to be informed.
- Noted that the Community Infrastructure paper was coming up later on the Agenda and this will contribute to the discussion.

Under 2.4 – Northern Fringe (East) – Noted that the Joint Area Action Plan had begun.

Discussion:

- Query when the Section 29 Committee would next meet, having only met once. Noted that a meeting could be called when there was an issue to discuss. Query that the Joint Area Action Plan required ‘a vision’ and that the S.29 Committee should lead on this, would there not be public consultation required, workshops set up etc, and these should be sooner rather than later.
- It was noted that this was not necessarily the correct forum for this issue as it relates to plenary policy considerations. Some discussion followed around the importance of moving this issue on.

Under 2.5.2 – Orchard Park, K1 site – City Council land will provide the site for this self-build project on the K1 site of Orchard Park. A Phase 1 report is being commissioned with Horizons funding, in order to move this on.

Discussion:

- Noted that the Orchard Park Residents Association had shown considerable interest.
- Noted that Uttons Drove was vital for Northstowe.

Under 2.6 – Cambourne – Result of CCC bid for Government money for a secondary school still awaited. Noted that this is due in March and that bid was for £26m only. Concerns were noted re outcome. Cambourne children currently bussed into City.

Under 2.7 – Northstowe – Government have listed Northstowe as a potential Eco-Town. JoM is currently working on examining whether we could meet the targets required. Should it be deemed possible, then this will come to the Northstowe Delivery Board.

Discussion:

- It was noted that the final Eco Town bid should be circulated to members to keep them informed. Further noted that members should have been briefed as a result of the working group meeting. Implications and deliverability issues were currently being investigated, but should bear in mind only a bid for funding at the moment.

- JoM reported on a recent Northstowe Forum meeting who were supportive of funding for an extra 'study'. Suggestions from the meeting include a Demonstrator Project;
- Noted that submissions were required within a tight timescale. How confident were we of achieving this? Noted that it was particularly tight for the Demonstrator Project, but confident that deadline would be met.

Section 3 – Quality of Life and Strategic Infrastructure

AP noted there had been over 50 applications for the Cambridgeshire Quality Panel. Officers were currently sifting through these before they would come to the Appointment Panel for final choice.

On going training work with the Quality Charter was being driven by the Quality Charter Steering group (QCSG) led by Cllr Hardy.

Discussion:

- NH considered that the Quality Panel could/should have an expert on Street Design, to assist with connectivity and urban design elements, particularly transport? Also training in that area through the Quality Charter Training Programme?
- AP noted that it was hoped to achieve an expert on street design for the Panel and that with regard QC Training, this would need to go before the QCSG.

Section Appx A – SRR Exception Report

Content of report was noted.

Discussion:

- Query whether the Clay Farm appeal was a primary risk in itself?
- Under Risk 11.2 and 11.3 – Funding and Joint Working – Noted that potential for Joint Working needed to be clear as it could only be when jointly beneficial. Northstowe, for example, was a high priority for SCDC but necessarily for the City. Mutual benefit required.
- Noted that mutuality already exists, with SCDC officers assisting on issues across the City.
- AP noted that SOB was currently examining this Register, and that an updated SRR would go through to Audit and Risk prior to Main Board. JSGIC should note that in this instance, as the SRR is updated for MB once a quarter, the version before this JSGIC meeting is from December 2009. The exception report highlighting the 'changes' since.

6. Community Infrastructure across Growth Sites

JoM's paper had been circulated.

Main Points:

JoM outlined current situation with the Strategic Affordable Housing Group. This paper outlined proposal for a Joint Community Infrastructure Group to be set up to ensure resources for deliverability were available to carry out the work required as projects went through the Planning process.

3.2 outlines the detail of the proposal, the Group to meet every 2/3 months, and reporting through SOB to JSGIC.

Discussion:

- Noted that in principle this was a good idea;

- A need to include members of the 'voluntary' sector – i.e. ACRE;
- Would require a clear Terms of Reference as to objectives and ensure no duplication;
- Noted that the current arrangements were resource intensive;
- Policy arrangements would come back to members;
- ToR could be based on those current for Northstowe Community Partnership Group, starting of small and drawing others in as required.

Agreed:

- The early establishment of the 'Community Infrastructure and Services Group' with Terms of Reference and a draft work plan to be reported to Senior Officer Board was agreed.
- Inclusion of a Voluntary Sector representative advised.

7. **Water Cycle Strategy**

SF introduced two representatives from Halcrow, Alison Mallows and Elliott Gill, and recapped on Water Cycle Strategy work reported previously to JSGIC members. She noted that the results of this report would assist in steering Infrastructure Planning. She then handed over to AM.

Main Points of Presentation:

- Phase 1 had highlighted water service infrastructure required to enable proposed development;
- Phase 2 was the high level vision which used a 'Multi-criteria analysis approach' to consider all aspects of sustainability;
- The results of the multi-criteria weighting were shown and the different scenario categories explained;
- The scenarios were then scored against the MCA criteria and compared with 'whole-life' costs;
- Through this current process, members now needed to develop chosen scenarios to provide infrastructure plan and policy pathway for implementation;
- Minimum standards for the future, as set by government, were reviewed, alongside more 'visionary' goals which may be attainable for both surface water and waste water;
- Halcrow's initial projections through each scenario were shown.

Discussion:

- Query regarding current legislation for water meters. Noted that different attitudes in different areas. Cambridge area pricing explained, water is getting cheaper;
- Query whether different scenarios could be decided on, on a site by site basis? Noted that this was possible, model was adaptable;
- Was the model used influenced by industrial use? No, it considered housing stock only, noting that the Environment Agency planned water resources as a whole;
- Noted that metering for water did not necessarily influence a lower requirement;
- Steer required as to whether work should be directed toward Baseline+, visionary or Vision Plus standards;
- Vision Plus costs noted in the presentation as circa £60m whole life costs. This was based over 100 years;
- Two key factors for consideration going forward: how will local authorities be engaged and how will this translate into policy?

Some of the solutions may be more appropriate in some areas than others. The analysis needs to be refined;

- Another key issue is where the cost falls, on householders then a matter of public policy but if on local authorities then a simpler issue of whether to ask for Code 4/5/6 etc.
- Considered to be moving in the right direction, but clearly more work required yet;
- Steering Group for WCS consists not only of local authorities but representative from the EA and the Water Companies. This information will be put before the Steering group who would look to translate the information into Infrastructure Planning in the short/medium/long term;
- Noted that the results of all consultation will come back to Main Board in September 2010;
- Requested that any report and/or presentation for Sept. Board should be circulated well in advance to give members time to study the information properly due to the technical content. Steering Group to liaise with the relevant portfolio holders at each authority prior to MB meeting.
- SDT thanked SF and Halcrow's representatives, noting that this work will proceed.

8. Government Agencies Update: Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service

SDT introduced Graham Stagg, Chief Fire Officer for Cambridgeshire. GS thanked JSGIC members for the opportunity to speak with them regarding the provision of Fire Services currently for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

- He then outlined provision currently – 26 Fire Stations, of which 3 were 'whole-time' manned, 3 were 'day-time manned' and the rest were 'retained';
- Retained was a much cheaper and very effective way of providing cover; Current cost to households was £58 per year, on Band 'D' rate;
- Stations are sited where they are based on 'property risk';
- Analysis, which is ongoing, shows that current sites of Fire Stations are in the right place in Cambridgeshire;
- Resources are heavily based on Prevention, with legislation such as fire retardant materials and furnishings assisting in this regard;
- There is no longer a 'push' for residential sprinkler systems, noting that they are cost preventive;
- Fire Authorities investigate trends and factors before deciding where a Fire Station should be sited, and a Station is not necessarily required to deliver the service ;
- Fires in the workplace are plummeting due to Fire Safety Compliance and Health & Safety directives;
- Some facts and figures:
- Every 10,000 of population produces 105 calls per year of which 51 are false alarms, 34 are fires of which 16 will be rubbish fires, and 7 calls will be RTA's. Out of the 34 actual fires, half are out by the time the engine arrives;
- A 'retained' engine costs £110,000 per year to operate, to change one station from retained to full time manned would require a 7% increase in the Band D rate;

- Within the Making Cambridgeshire Count initiative, the future of Fire Stations will be along the lines of multi-functional public buildings housing police and fire, amongst others.
- Before the siting of a Fire Station, model investigates in great detail the routes and possible speeds locally, types of buildings locally which may be more prone to fire;
- Fire Service will not receive any money in the coming years and therefore there is a strong need to ensure we do not 'over egg' the pudding!

Discussion:

- Request for the 'facts and figures' to be circulated in written format;
- Is the Fire Service now resigned to the fact there will be no household sprinkler systems in Northstowe? GS noted they were not 'resigned' but were aware there would be no government support for this. Emphasis would be on smoke detectors;
- Query whether there was the possibility of a plot of land with a garage and a 'retained' engine at Northstowe? Noted that this was an emotive issue, and understood the economics of this. It would have to be a multi-functional building and if so was possible;
- Query whether tenure of housing was a factor in determining greater risk?
- GS noted that national statistics do show a trend that where there is more affordable housing the busier the Fire Service is;
- Noted that the appearance of rapid response to fires on open spaces involving abandoned cars being set alight, is paramount. If the people who set these fires are not gratified by being able to watch them burn, they tend to happen less frequently;
- GS noted that with the introduction of strategies such as the government's 'scrappage' scheme and the good price for scrap metal, abandoned car fires had fallen dramatically.

GS

SDT thanked GS very much for attending and giving his report.

9. Forward Agenda Items

Agenda for April to include:

- Resources Report;
- Housing Economist.

10. Any other Business

There was none.

11. Date of next meeting:

Tuesday 20th April, 2010 at 1400, at The Moller Centre, Storeys Way, Cambridge

The meeting closed at 1229.