

## **Joint Strategic Growth Implementation Committee**

### **Minutes from the Committee Meeting of Tuesday 4<sup>th</sup> December 2007 (2pm – 4pm) Council Chamber, South Cambridgeshire District Council, Cambourne**

#### **Committee Members Present:**

Sir David Trippier, Chairman

Cllr Dr David Bard, South Cambridgeshire District Council  
Cllr Simon Edwards, South Cambridgeshire District Council  
Cllr Nichola Harrison, Cambridgeshire County Council  
Cllr Sebastian Kindersley, South Cambridgeshire District Council  
Cllr Ian Nimmo-Smith, Cambridge City Council  
John Onslow, Cambridgeshire Horizons  
Cllr Roy Pegram, Cambridgeshire County Council  
Cllr Sian Reid, Cambridge City Council  
Cllr John Reynolds, Cambridgeshire County Council

#### **Also in attendance:**

Margaret Allen, Housing Corporation  
Steve Hampson, South Cambridgeshire District Council  
Graham Hughes, Cambridgeshire County Council  
Brian Human, Cambridge City Council  
Colin Lacombe, Cambridgeshire Constabulary  
Paul Mumford, Cambridgeshire Horizons (Minutes)  
Brian Smith, Cambridgeshire County Council  
Julie Spence, Cambridgeshire Constabulary  
Peter Studdert, Director for Joint Planning (Cambridge Growth Areas and Northstowe)

#### **Apologies:**

Cllr Lewis Herbert, Cambridge City Council  
Cllr Ray Manning, South Cambridgeshire District Council  
Tricia Shilling, Cambridgeshire Constabulary

#### **PART 1 (Public)**

#### **Actions**

#### **Item 1 – Welcome and Apologies**

- 1.1 The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting of the Joint Strategic Growth Implementation Committee.
- 1.2 Apologies had been received from Cllr Lewis Herbert, Cllr Ray Manning and Tricia Shilling.

## **Item 2 – Minutes of the Joint Strategic Growth Implementation Committee – 17 October 2007**

- 2.1 The Minutes were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting of Wednesday 17 October 2007.

## **Item 3 – Matters Arising**

- 3.1 Item 6.2 (e), innovative ways of funding. The Chairman reported that a meeting had been arranged at the Horizons office for 5<sup>th</sup> December 2007 with Anglian Water Service, EEDA, GCP.
- 3.2 Cllr Nichola Harrison asked if Deloitte would be at the meeting. John Onslow responded that they would not be on this occasion. Chairman suggested that once this meeting had taken place decisions could be made on the way forward and Deloitte's should be involved.
- 3.3 Cllr Nichola Harrison commented that the outcome should be reported to JSGIC. Chairman agreed that this was important.
- 3.4 Cllr Sian Reid suggested that further work should wait for the outcome of low carbon appraisal of Long Term Delivery Plan.
- 3.5 Chairman suggested that to address the funding gap across the sub-region, partners should look at the actual schemes required to help deliver growth and that funding would normally be project specific.
- 3.6 Cllr Nichola Harrison suggested exploration of an individual project, for example the new Chesterton Station, to see if securing one project could help with delivery overall.
- 3.7 Cllr John Reynolds agreed on the importance of the issue, but that it may be appropriate to view schemes as a package and consider which bodies could bring forward the up-front resources e.g. for transport schemes rather than focusing on individual projects.
- 3.8 Cllr Dr David Bard commented that the Cambridge Sub-region is not unique in the growth areas and would be useful to learn from others e.g. Milton Keynes.
- 3.9 Item 7.2(c) John Onslow suggested that a position statement is required from Marshall Aerospace as landowner as well as Defence Estates. Agreed to raise this at meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> December with Marshall, Ministry of Defence and Go-East.
- 3.10 Cllr Sian Reid expressed concern about the position of Marshall

**Chairman**

**Director for  
Development**

Aerospace in relation to relocation, suggesting that this matter should not wait for the Ministerial visit to be addressed. The Chairman commented on need for continued Ministerial support and agreed to write to the Minister.

- 3.11 Cllr Sebastian Kindersley commented that pressure must be put onto all parties and that Marshall Aerospace should be approached directly.
- 3.12 Cllr Roy Pegram reported that the Ministry of Defence are also having difficulty with Marshall Aerospace on securing commitment to progress.
- 3.13 John Onslow commented that we would report concerns of this group at the next meeting of Marshall Aerospace, Ministry of Defence and GO-East.

#### **Item 4 – Tabled correspondence and report deadlines**

- 4.1 The Chairman presented a paper on protocol for tabled correspondence and report deadlines.
- 4.2 Cllr Sian Reid suggested that Cambridgeshire Horizons should determine if the papers/letters should be tabled and that Committee members can be reached directly by any interested party. The Committee agreed this.

#### **Item 5 – Resource Deployment**

- 5.1 John Onslow reported that Horizons have been through recruitment and have made offers to two Delivery Managers, adding that consultancy studies are being monitored, for example the Water Cycle Strategy and proposed GIS partnership work.
- 5.2 Cllr John Reynolds asked whether successful recruitment at Horizons meant that all programmes would be delivered on time and without slippage. John Onslow commented that staff have been recruited to help manage the process, noting that slippage can occur for a number of reasons.
- 5.3 Cllr Sian Reid expressed concern that Cambridge City Council had a mixed experience of recruitment and much of the interest was from internal staff. Cllr Dr David Bard echoed the concerns of Cllr Sian Reid.
- 5.4 Sir David Trippier commented on appointment of new Chief Executive at Horizons, Mr Alex Plant, and that the process for appointment had been designed to be inclusive across all partners and that Horizons are delighted with the outcome.

## **Item 6 –Major Development Sites Progress Report including Government Agencies Update**

- 6.1 John Onslow presented paper, Sub-Regional Programme and Strategic Risk Register.
- 6.2 Cllr Nichola Harrison commented that this is a challenging report, as all members will have something to say on this, for example that progress on Cambridge East and Northern Fringe East is uncertain. Cllr Harrison added that the Committee may not need all of the text associated with the report if this is not addressing key issues.
- 6.3 Also important is that the risks flagged at red status are key for action and need to be addressed immediately. Suggested that it would be useful to have indication of changed status so that it is clear which areas have become more of a challenge.
- 6.4 John Onslow responded to say that officers are agreeing a format to bring to members and that numbers of red risks have been reduced (to five this month) to allow the committee to consider small numbers of risks.
- 6.5 The Chairman wanted confirmation that the City's report on Northern Fringe East was on track for January 2008. Brian Human explained two parallel elements of work on this site: Cambridge City Council Core Strategy and work to be commissioned by Horizons summarising previous feasibility work.
- 6.6 Cllr Sebastian Kindersley voiced his concerns about windfall sites and whether these are being taken into account in the planning for infrastructure, for example Hauxton.
- 6.7 Peter Studdert commented that the Joint Development Control Committee will not address such sites but the cumulative impact of all sites does need to be considered.
- 6.8 Cllr John Reynolds commented that the register could be set out more clearly to identify the areas to be addressed. Also that some elements of the register were out of date. Suggested that the focus was placed on an area of interest, for example waste. Cllr Reynolds suggested that he felt the present register had been massaged.
- 6.9 The Chairman disagreed with some of the comments made by Cllr Reynolds. Furthermore, he believed that this Committee was not solely set up to constantly scrutinise progress and process but for all of the Partners to work positively together to achieve the agreed development goals.
- 6.10 John Onslow responded that the documents were signed off by the Senior Officer Board prior to coming to Committee.

- 6.11 Cllr Sian Reid commented that the priority is to focus on the areas where partners must work together better, rather than to criticise particular pieces of work.
- 6.12 Graham Hughes reported that the County consider the risk around delivery of transport infrastructure is being managed and should not be at 'red' status.
- 6.13 Cllr Nichola Harrison commented that the risk around meeting housing trajectories and the timely implementation of planning permissions means there is an opportunity to explore what enforcement powers local authorities have to bring development forward.
- 6.14 John Onslow commented that this issue had been raised at the Developers' Forum.
- 6.15 Peter Studdert commented that there is relatively little local authorities can do, as the sale of houses is ultimately market-driven. It may be possible to restrict the length of times for planning permissions to be implemented or for reserved matters to be submitted.

**Item 7 – Update from the Housing Corporation - Presentation by Margaret Allen**

- 7.1 Cllr Sian Reid asked what the relationship would be between the new agency and transport. Margaret Allen responded that the new agency will not deliver transport but will be part of the partnership team. This will work by preparing a single strategy for the region.
- 7.2 Cllr Nichola Harrison commented that there is a funding gap and asked how the Housing Corporation were addressing this. Margaret Allen responded that the government have set efficiency targets and that the East of England is most the most efficient region; the Housing Corporation would typically fund 40% of total cost.
- 7.3 Cllr Nichola Harrison asked if it is likely to be the case that sites will be ready to be delivered but there will be no money to fund the affordable housing. Margaret Allen replied that this was unlikely given rate that sites come forward, adding that funding is in place for strategic sites.
- 7.4 The Chairman asked when the new chief executive would be announced for the new agency, adding that the Cambridge Sub-Region had been promised the first visit of the new chief executive. Margaret Allen responded that an announcement was expected imminently.

**Item 8 – Update from the Cambridgeshire Constabulary - Julie Spence and Colin Luscombe.**

- 8.1 Julie Spence commented that the risk of failing to deliver adequate policing provision must be understood and addressed.
- 8.2 Julie Spence gave an explanation of policing position, that to maintain level of service additional resources are needed as new developments come forward, adding that whatever policing requirements are needed at one particular area, there will be knock-on requirements through force.
- 8.3 Julie Spence commented that existing provision will not be able to cope and that 250 new staff will be required across the growth sites. The police are keen to have a neighbourhood presence to look at “one-stop-shop” approach.
- 8.4 Cllr Dr David Bard asked how have figures for new staff requirements been reached? Colin Luscombe replied that the figures presented are for the Eastern region as a whole. A formula has been calculated to show cost per dwelling gives capital and revenue requirements. Colin Luscombe added that the police are keen not to miss the opportunity of securing contribution from new development.
- 8.5 Cllr Dr David Bard asked how will the new development relates to existing policing provision. Julie Spence responded by saying that using the neighbourhood policing model should not lead to any change to the existing structure of provision.
- 8.6 Cllr Sebastian Kindersley thanked Julie Spence for her report and asked for greater understanding of the funding gap: will developers be expected to fill the gap that the government is not filling. Julie Spence responded that there is a need for the Government to recognise under-funding and that this has effectively decreased the resource base, adding that if Cambridgeshire had the national average provision, it would be possible to police the expanded County. An announcement will be made on 6<sup>th</sup> December at the outcome of discussion with the Home Secretary.
- 8.7 Cllr John Reynolds asked what the position is with the Cambourne facility. Colin Luscombe replied that the planning application was submitted eight weeks ago and a decision is expected soon. Matters around the visibility splay and potential wind turbine had been discussed. The facility will have a nine-month build period and is expected to open January/February 2009.
- 8.8 Cllr John Reynolds asked whether funding was secure for the police if growth-related increase in funding did not materialise. Also mentioned Mereham and the risk that a planning permission granted for this proposal will prompt many other planning applications across the country.
- 8.9 Julie Spence commented that even with funding related to the growth agenda there is a need to seek up-front, early,

infrastructure, and that the police will endeavour to provide the best service with whatever resource is available.

- 8.10 Discussion around how the policing requirements are being addressed in on-going Section 106 negotiations. Peter Studdert commented that this was the first view of the figures and that a meeting would take place on 6<sup>th</sup> December to consider the developers' plans for a community facility at the Cambridge Southern Fringe.
- 8.11 Colin Luscombe confirmed that he would attend on 6<sup>th</sup> December and commented on importance of maintaining good lines of communication.
- 8.12 Cllr Nichola Harrison asked how the police were progressing with designing-out crime. Colin Luscombe replied that the architectural liaison officer for the division was available to support the local authorities with design of new communities.
- 8.13 Cllr Sebastian Kindersley commented that the police requirement for funds on a per-dwelling basis had not been sought from new development before now. Colin Luscombe replied that work to prepare the requirement had been ongoing and that the intention was to apply the approach from herein.

## **Item 9 – Tariff System**

- 9.1 The Chairman introduced discussion on tariff systems for collecting developer contributions, commenting that even in recent reports from the Government there could still be an element of money collected at a local level that could be transferred elsewhere within the region. The new Planning Bill (published 27<sup>th</sup> November) will need to be studied in detail. The Chairman proposed a half-day seminar chaired by Peter Studdert early in the New Year to address this.
- 9.2 Peter Studdert summarised his understanding of the Bill and that a new power is being introduced through the LDF process to request contributions to facilities not directly related to development. This would have to be reasoned through the LDF process, which will be a challenge. Given the timing of major sites around Cambridge, these are likely to be negotiated on a Circular 05/05 basis and that discussions around the new Planning Bill should not draw attention away from this.
- 9.3 Peter Studdert commented that there does seem to be scope address the cumulative impact of small developments. A concern at local level would be the influence of the Treasury on local authorities. The Chairman commented that the word “tariff” is not used in the new Planning Bill. Peter Studdert to prepare a note setting out his understanding of the new Planning Bill and to attach views from the technical press.
- 9.4 The Chairman reported that an announcement on the Housing

Growth Fund settlement is expected in the next few days and suggested that a Founder Members meeting would be needed in January, to be organised by the County Council as lead Authority.

**Item 10 – Agenda Plan**

Noted by the Committee.

**Item 11 – Date of Next Meeting**

Noted by the Committee. 6<sup>th</sup> February 10.00 – 12 noon.