

**Joint Strategic Growth Implementation Committee Meeting**  
**21<sup>st</sup> July 2010**  
**The Swansley Room, South Cambridgeshire District Council Hall,**  
**Cambourne, Cambs**

**Committee Members:**

**Name**

Sir David Trippier (SDT)	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 Clare Blair (CB)	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Lewis Herbert (LH)	Cambridge City Council
Alex Plant (AP)	Cambridgeshire Horizons
John Williamson (JW)	Cambridgeshire Horizons

**APOLOGIES:**

Cllr Lewis Herbert (LH)	Cambridge City Council
Cllr Roy Pegram (RP) substituted	Cambridgeshire County Council
John Onslow	Cambridgeshire County Council
Steve Hampson	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Simon Payne (SP) substituted	Cambridge City Council

**SUBSTITUTES:**

Cllr John Reynolds (JR) for Cllr Pegram	Cambridgeshire County Council
---	-------------------------------

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

Peter Studdert (PS)	Joint Planning Director
Jo Mills	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Tim Wetherfield (sub for SP)	Cambridge City Council
Alison Cook (Item 9 only)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Hazel Belchamber	Cambridgeshire County Council
Graham Hughes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Laura Halstead	Cambridgeshire Horizons
Gill Barker (minutes)	Cambridgeshire Horizons

**Noted that Item 1 on the Agenda had been held in 'Closed' Session due to the commercially sensitive nature of the issue discussed.**

## **Actions**

### **2. Welcome and Apologies**

SDT welcomed all to the meeting and noted the apologies and substitutes as listed above.

### **3. Declarations of Interest**

SR – Item 1 – Land owned by Cambridge City Council  
JR – Director and Chair of Renewables East

### **4. Minutes of the Meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> February 2010**

The Minutes were agreed.

### **5. Matters Arising**

There were none.

### **6. Pruning for Growth Update**

AP reported that the Senior Officer Board (SOB) were currently reviewing resources for growth in the Cambridge sub-region and whether they could be utilised more efficiently. At a recent meeting, particular officers had been charged with examining specific areas and were to report back to the next SOB Resources session. PS and Sharon Brown were reviewing Planning and Development resources against a forecast timeline for the various stages of the planning and development process for the known sites. SP had been tasked with future structures based on reduced resources and funding, examining a number of differing scenarios.

SOB will discuss the results at a meeting scheduled for September and will report further to JSGIC in October.

#### Discussion:

- Noted that this was a useful exercise at any time, but particularly so now;
- Queried whether this work was taking into consideration the loss of Housing and Planning Delivery Grant (HPDG) already suffered by local authorities. AP noted that SP was dealing with this, looking at various levels of current and possible further future funding cuts;
- Noted that Horizons Main Board would review all Horizons budgets at the next meeting, to examine where savings could be made, with the emphasis on more 'shared' services;
- Noted that the loss of HPDG for local authorities had been significant and query what 'pruning' was happening at Horizons. Noted that this would form part of the report and options to the next Main Board meeting;
- PS noted a report he had just read which could be good news for funding in areas which were actively building houses, as it suggests that the local authorities could retain six years of council tax/business rates relating to new build.
- Queried whether this was a time for cutting out non-essential work, and a steer from this Committee at this time could help? AP noted that a steer would be necessary, and this was why the broader issues around work plans and funding would come back to Main Board, as Horizons was a countywide local delivery vehicle;

## 7. **Communicating the Benefits of Growth**

LH's paper had been circulated. She drew attention to the following:

- This update was due to a request at the last JSGIC meeting and shows the planned activity over the current year;
- A steer was required as to whether the work content was as required;
- Noted that this work was to promote 'Growth' and not to promote Horizons.

### Discussion:

- Noted that this work stream did not involve costs other than staff time, working in partnership with all local authorities;
- Query as to who deals with the Social media sites. Noted that just LH dealt with all Social Media sites such as Twitter and Youtube;

### Agreed:

The planned activity, as listed within the report was agreed as appropriate.

## 8. **Major Development Sites progress Report**

JW's report had been circulated. He drew attention to the following:

- Site specific one-page reports were attached as appendices – were these useful?;
- Activity now centred on Southern fringes and Cambridge North West;
- Housing Growth Fund - Year 3 Capital had been confirmed as all but secure, but had not yet been received. As a result, a letter from all six local authority leaders had been sent to Henry Cleary, Deputy Director of Communities and Local Government (CLG) seeking early release of funds so as not to delay projects any further;
- 1.4 - Glebe Farm – Homes & Communities Agency (HCA) Kickstart funding has been scrapped, but Countryside Properties suggest this site could proceed if Housing Growth Fund (HGF) Equity investment could be found;
- 1.5.3 – Chesterton Station - Good 'value for money' scheme, ranked 3<sup>rd</sup> in the Regional Funding Allocation (RFA) pot which has now been suspended until after the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) in October. As a result, the CCC and partners are working to source potential alternative funding;
- SRR – Future funding is now a red risk – JW noted that the CLG intends to bid for continued funding for HGF through the CSR;
- 3.0 – Quality of Life – Quality Panel had the first meeting at which it considered both Trumpington Meadows and Cambridge University's North West sites;
- Appendix 3 – 3.2 – Orchard Park Retail Study outcomes now available.

### Discussion:

- PS noted that the final Outline planning permission for Clay Farm has now been given, along with permission for the spine road. The NIAB site was due to come up in September, and forecast to date for this to achieve permission was good. This allows for 3,000 new homes, 40% of which would be 'affordable';
- A14 – Query regarding the status of proposed development of Northstowe and Cambridge North West sites should the funding for upgrade proposed to the A14 be cut in the CSR. Should there be a 'Plan B'? Noted that the Highways Agency (HA) representative at Horizons Main Board had reported that the HA had re-submitted for

- the full cost of the proposal and was therefore still supporting it;
- It was reported that CCC were currently drafting a discussion document regarding a 'Plan B' should the HA's bid to CSR fail;
  - Noted that the City Council had already written to Philip Hammond giving other options;
  - Further noted that the HA representative at Horizons Board had confirmed that, without the £1.2b upgrade, the HA could 'object' to any development in the catchment of the A14 under their 'Nil detriment' policy;
  - Concern that any reduction in funding for this scheme will cause time delays which would effectively stop any growth in this corridor;
  - Noted that seeking conditions from the HA/Government on delivery of the proposal within 2-3 years could ensure that it did not occur;
  - CCC had already noted potential for 'value engineering changes' which could result in up to £100m savings, and 'phasing' could assist. However, HA would push for western section first which would not assist development;
  - Noted that, working on the basis that the current full £1.2b scheme may not go ahead, there was common ground within the authorities for elements of upgrade;
  - The planning permission for the NIAB site was conditional on A14 'improvements', not necessarily the full scheme, otherwise only 300 houses could be built;
  - Noted that only 1500 – 2000 houses could be built in total without 'improvements' to the A14.
  - The ramifications of the Marshall decision on the Cambridge East site will also have to be dealt with, perhaps through the S.29 Committee?

Agreed:

- Up to the CSR in October, all involved to lobby government regarding keeping to the original timescales in order to achieve growth. CCC to lead;
- GH to come back to JSGIC with a discussion document regarding the A14, and a possible 'Plan B', addressing the issue both as a whole, and specifically in relation to CNW, Northstowe and Cambridge East.

All

GH

## 9. Multi Storey buildings for new Build Primary Schools

AC's report had been circulated. The main points were:

This had been brought about by the challenge faced by the County and developers to deliver only single storey schools, both in land requirement and cost of build, as this was CCC policy;

Independent research has been commissioned, carried out by Cambridge University, at a cost of £3.6k which has set out the pro's and con's of both single and multi storey schools. As a result the County have now adopted a more flexible policy of allowing the decision as to whether a single or a multi storey school should be provided, on a case-by-case basis.

Discussion:

- General agreement that this study was a valuable piece of work and that the change to a more flexible policy on provision of schools was welcomed;
- A need to ensure that schools do not only 'sit comfortably within the overall development context' but also 'within the overall development and quality of place';
- Buildings need to be adaptable to deal with the changes in demand

for schooling – consider the Cambourne example;

- When considering the development of school buildings, should also include possible commercial aspects, as per the Freiburg example;
- Query regarding consultation prior to proposal being put forward to CCC Cabinet? Noted that there had been officer involvement and a Seminar held to which members of all local authorities had been invited;
- Noted that JSGIC was intended as a ‘discussion forum’ for just such proposals, prior to endorsement by individual authority, and that perhaps it should have been brought much earlier in the process?;
- Noted that this was an enabling study, which had resulted from both design and planning queries in the past;
- School design was clearly dependant upon the teaching/learning aspects, but was also bound by the constraints of the site, urban design and flexibility of use. With primary schools having previously been constrained to single storey only, this new flexibility is welcomed;
- Noted that this report would not be ‘shelved’, and would now inform all stages of procurement and development.

SDT thanked both Alison Cook and Hazel Belchamber of CCC for presenting this information.

**10. Forward Agenda Items**

Noted.

**11. Any other Business**

Query regarding status of Northstowe. JW noted that the Northstowe Delivery Board had taken place on 20<sup>th</sup> July, and was positive, although there was no formal agreement between the HCA and Gallaghers to report yet.

**12. Date of next meeting:**

26<sup>th</sup> October, 2010, 1430 at The Kreis Viersen Room, Shire Hall, Castle Hill, Cambridge.

The meeting closed at 1235.