

ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES

- Date:** Thursday, 17th October 2019
- Time:** 10.00 a.m. to 11.15 a.m.
- Present:** Councillors: D Ambrose Smith, H Batchelor, I Bates (Chairman), R Fuller, M Goldsack, L Harford, R Hickford, N Kavanagh and J Williams
- Apologies:** Councillors: D Connor (Substituted by Councillor M Goldsack), T Sanderson, S Tierney (Substituted by Councillor R Hickford) and T Wotherspoon (Vice-Chairman) (Substituted by Councillor L Harford).

272. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor R Fuller declared a non-statutory disclosable interest under the Code of Conduct in relation to agenda item no. 8, 'Alconbury Weald Ermine Street Little Stukeley – Outline Planning Application Consultation Response', as a Member of Huntingdonshire District Council's Planning Committee. He would continue to attend the meeting for that item, but would not take part in the discussion or vote.

273. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 19th September 2019 were agreed as a correct record.

274. MINUTE ACTION LOG

The Minutes Action Log was noted.

275. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions or petitions were received by the deadline.

276. CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH WASTE AND MINERALS LOCAL PLAN – PROPOSED SUBMISSION PLAN

The Committee received a report seeking approval for the Proposed Submission of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (MWLP) for public consultation during November 2019 – January 2020 and then submission to the Secretary of State for independent examination.

Individual Members raised the following issues in relation to the report:

- queried whether the statement regarding access found in the Urban Edge / New Development Principles should also apply to the Urban Location Principles. The Joint Interim Assistant Director, Environment and Commercial Services stated that this related to the planning guidance set out in the Location and Design of Waste Management Facilities Supplementary Planning Document

(SPD). She confirmed that with any planning application officers would consider the need for access to come via the existing network and not through local villages unless necessary. She confirmed that this was already the case, where compliance with adopted Core Strategy Policy CS32 meant that officers also looked at the transport network and routing agreements with any new planning application, so the guidance in the SPD was only part of the consideration.

- raised concerns regarding the effects of future policy changes had on long term restoration projects such as the Barrington CEMEX site and asked if there was a way to plan for these policy changes. The Joint Interim Assistant Director, Environment and Commercial Services informed Members that it was possible to review restoration projects if priorities changed. The example given related to elements of the historical Block Fen mineral permissions where the restoration schemes approved were not compliant with the wider aspirations for complementary habitat creation to the Ouse Washes under the current development plan. In this example, the Joint Interim Assistant Director, Environment and Commercial Services explained that where new extensions and proposals came forward, Officers sought to seek amendments to the earlier restoration schemes to reflect these changes; so there was no reason not to seek similar amendments if necessary moving forward. This included the need to review land use and reversibility, e.g. if wet grassland needed to be changed back to an agricultural use for food production in the future, this was also possible in the Block Fen example used.
- queried the 'if feasible' wording found in section c) of 'Policy 19: Restoration and Aftercare' of Appendix A of the report. The Joint Interim Assistant Director, Environment and Commercial Services clarified that in some applications, compliance with this policy would not be possible and this is why it stated 'if feasible', so this would need to be considered and justified on a case-by-case basis. She commented that as the work on the A14 had been performed through a Development Consent Order (DCO), there had not been a requirement for the planning applications for the borrow pits to come to the Council, which had led to some of the concerns on aftercare and restoration being raised by the Councillor.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Approve the Proposed Submission ('Publication Draft') Minerals and Waste Local Plan as attached at Appendix A to the report, for the purpose of both its final consultation for a minimum of six weeks (at some point between November 2019 and January 2020 - if the consultation period includes the Christmas week, then consultation will run for up to eight weeks); AND its subsequent submission to the Secretary of State for the purpose of independent examination.
- b) Approve the proposed Policies Map (including associated inset maps) as attached at Appendix B to the report, for the purpose of consultation alongside the Local Plan consultation AND its subsequent submission to the Secretary of State for consideration alongside the examination of the Local Plan.

- c) Delegate to the Business Manager, County Planning, Minerals and Waste and / or Joint Interim Assistant Director Environment and Commercial, any presentational improvements, factual updating, or other inconsequential changes (e.g. correcting typographical errors) to the Publication Draft Plan or Policies Map that (taken together) do not materially affect the policies set out in the Local Plan prior to the consultation commencing, or changes necessary to address any minor amendments arising from the Plan's consideration by Peterborough City County Council's democratic process.
- d) Delegate to the Executive Director Place and Economy and the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee in consultation with the authority to make more substantive changes to the Plan as attached, prior to consultation, provided he should see fit to do so, and if it would address more substantive suggested amendments arising from the Plan's consideration by Peterborough City Council's democratic process.
- e) Delegate to the Business Manager, County Planning, Minerals and Waste and / or Joint Interim Assistant Director Environment and Commercial the ability to agree and consult upon a set of proposed modifications during the examination process (most likely at the very end of the examination process), if asked by the Inspector to do so.

277. REVIEW OF RISK REGISTER FOR PLACE AND ECONOMY

The Committee received a report presenting the Place and Economy (P&E) Risk Register. The Service Director, Highways and Transport drew the Committee's attention to the two risks identified in the report, stressing that this did not mean that these were the only risks in the P&E Service. He commented that each directorate within P&E had its own risk register.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Note and comment on the Risk Register.

278. ANNUAL UPDATE FROM CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH TRADING STANDARDS SHARED SERVICE

The Committee received a report providing an update in the form of an annual report, on the work being delivered for the County Council by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Trading Standards Shared Service. The Committee received a presentation by the Head of Regulatory Services highlighting the information found within the annual report.

Individual Members raised the following issues in relation to the report:

- raised concerns regarding the wide range of activities the Regulatory Service covered and whether they had enough staff to address all the issues they were faced with. The Head of Regulatory Services stated that it would be beneficial to have more resources, but he was conscious of the financial challenges the Council faced, and they therefore had to make the most of the resources

available. He agreed that the remit of Trading Standards was large and commented that because of this, they focused on specific areas that caused the most detriment, by doing this they had remained effective. He stated they had been selling their services to gain external funding that would help reduce the amount of funding needed to be put into the services by the Council.

- queried how often the Service inspected sports grounds. The Head of Regulatory Services confirmed that the frequency of inspections depended on the nature and complexity of the ground and the number and type of events being held there. He suggested that if it was a larger ground that facilitated a variety of popular events throughout the year, it would be subjected to more inspections. The Service would work closely with organisers to ensure people's safety at these events.
- sought more information regarding the relationship between the Community Protection Team and the Head of Regulatory Services' Team. The Head of Regulatory Services clarified that the Community Protection Team had previously been part of the Trading Standards structure. He stated that they still retained close links and remained a valuable resource.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Comment on any aspect of the service being delivered by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Trading Standards on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council.

279. ALCONBURY WEALD ERMINE STREET LITTLE STUKELEY – OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION RESPONSE

The Committee received a report requesting consideration and endorsement of the Officers' response to the outline planning application for a mixed-use development of up to 1,500 dwellings, local centre including retail and community facilities, primary school, open space, play areas, recreation facilities, landscaping, associated demolition, ground work and infrastructure. The Growth & Development Business Manager drew the Committee's attention to key points within the report and the appendices.

Individual Members raised the following issues in relation to the report:

- sought confirmation that the concern raised by the local Member was a Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC) matter and not for the County Council. The Growth & Development Business Manager stated that several Section 73 applications that had been submitted which focused on the Country Park and was therefore not a County Council issue. However, the Council still sought sufficient open space to be provided in the application. She confirmed that this had been flagged up with the Case Officer at HDC. The Case Officer had also been notified of the interest of the Local Member.
- raised concerns regarding the transport and public health implications of the application. He suggested that in terms of transport it seemed that no adequate modelling had been performed. In reference to health, the report stated that it

did not meet HDC's Local Plan. He commented that he was reluctant to agree recommendation b) as he believed major work would have to be performed on the application before it was then brought back to Committee. The Growth & Development Business Manager informed the Committee that this report was very much a work in progress. She confirmed that the objections Members had raised would be taken on board and resolved before the planning application was approved. Officers also advised that whilst the allocation had been modelled at a strategic level for Local Plan, this additional detail had not been assessed, or mitigation strategies proposed. As the assumptions had not been agreed and the process was not complete, Officers were not able to make a positive recommendation at this stage. It was stressed that the application was still very much at the early stages, and the issues raised would be followed up by the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Executive Director.

- queried whether the Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) was being replaced. The Growth & Development Business Manager confirmed that this was the case, she suggested that this depended on the existing site conditions. She stated that Officers were working with BREEAM to identify a more appropriate assessment method.
- queried whether a library would be built on the site. The Chairman stated that there would be, the site would also have a primary school and secondary school.

It was resolved by a majority to:

- a) Endorse the response as set out in Appendix 1; and
- b) Delegate to the Executive Director (Place and Economy) in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee the authority to make minor changes to the response.

280. COUNCILLOR APPOINTMENTS TO THE A505 ROYSTON TO GRANTA PARK STRATEGIC TRANSPORT AND GROWTH STUDY MEMBER STEERING GROUP

The Committee received a report requesting consideration of the establishment of an A505 Royston to Granta Park Strategic Growth and Transport Study Member Steering Group and to appoint three Cambridgeshire County Councillors to the Steering Group. The Principal Transport and Infrastructure Officer drew the Committee's attention to the Background and Main Issues sections of the report.

In discussion:

- Councillor Hickford stated that the A505 was a strategic route within the County and therefore it would be beneficial for the Steering Group received Local Member input. He proposed that County Councillors: I Bates, R Hickford and M Shuter be appointed as members of the group and County Councillors: L Harford, S van de Ven and T Wotherspoon be appointed as substitutes. This proposal was seconded by Councillor Goldsack.

- Councillor Williams proposed an amendment to Councillor Hickford's proposal, suggesting that Councillor M Shuter be replaced by Councillor H Batchelor. He informed the Committee that South Cambridgeshire District Council had agreed that there should be Local Member representation and political proportionality on the Steering Group. This amendment was seconded by Councillor Batchelor. On being put to the vote, this amendment was lost. On being put to the vote, Councillor Hickford's proposal was passed unanimously.
- The Chairman stated that he had been communicating with the appropriate portfolio holder at Hertfordshire County Council (HCC). HCC had been pleased that CCC were asking them to provide representation on the Steering Group. He informed the Committee that HCC had not yet provided him with the name of their Councillor on the Steering Group. The Chairman requested that Officers start to identify dates for the Steering Group **(Action Required)**

It was resolved by a majority to:

- a) Approve the establishment of the A505 Royston to Granta Park Strategic Growth and Transport Study Steering Group
- b) Appoint County Councillors I Bates, R Hickford and M Shuter to the Steering Group
- c) Appoint County Councillors L Harford, S van de Ven and T Wotherspoon as substitute Members to the Steering Group
- d) Invite Hertfordshire County Council to nominate a representative to the Steering Group

281. FINANCE MONITORING REPORT – AUGUST 2019

The Committee received a report outlining the Finance Monitoring Report (FMR) for Place & Economy Services as at the end of August 2019. The Strategic Finance Manager informed the Committee that a bottom line underspend of £1.9m was forecasted. The only significant variation on the budget for the Committee was the forecasted £494K underspend on Highways Development Management.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Review, note and comment upon the report

282. SERVICE COMMITTEE REVIEW OF DRAFT REVENUE BUSINESS PLANNING PROPOSALS FOR 2020-21 TO 2024-25

The Committee received a report providing an overview of the draft Business Plan Revenue Proposals for services that were within the remit of the Committee. The Service Director, Highways and Transport drew the Committee's attention to sections four and five of the report which were specific to Place and Economy (P&E). He commented that there were no business planning proposals coming forward that were in the remit of the Committee. It was noted that there were only two P&E proposals

going forward, but both were under the remit of the Highways and Infrastructure Committee.

One Member advised that Liberal Democrat Members would be abstaining on this item as they would be developing their own budget.

It was resolved by a majority to:

Note the overview and context provided for the 2020-21 to 2024-25 Business Plan revenue proposals for the Service

283. SERVICE COMMITTEE REVIEW OF THE DRAFT 202-21 CAPITAL PROGRAMME

The Committee received a report providing an overview of the draft Business Plan Capital Programme for Place and Economy. The Strategic Finance Manager drew the Committee's attention to the contents of the report.

It was resolved by a majority to:

- a) Note the overview and context provided for the 2020-21 Capital Programme for Place and Economy
- b) Comment on the draft proposals for Place and Economy's 2020-21 Capital Programme and endorse their development.

284. ELY BYPASS INTERNAL AUDIT REPORT

The Committee received a report providing a summary of the key findings and recommendations from the Internal Audit of the Ely Bypass project. The LGSS Chief Internal Auditor drew the Committee's attention to the information found within the report and appendices.

The Chairman then invited Councillor M Shellens, Chairman of the Audit and Accounts Committee to speak. Councillors Shellens informed the Committee that he had not been satisfied with the original report brought to the Audit and Accounts Committee. He suggested that the Committee could take comfort in the conclusion set out in the report that the contract provided value for money even with the significant overspend. He raised his concerns regarding how similar contracts in the future would be managed. He stated that the Audit and Accounts Committee had agreed that in future, Members needed to be informed more comprehensively throughout the life of a project and that the Project Board needed to have multi political party representation. He suggested that he had no confidence that the winning contractor would have been selected if the significant overspend had been known and he believed that the alternative routes had not been evaluated effectively.

- The Service Director, Highways and Transport commented that he had sat through the Audit & Accounts Committee meeting and had found the debate very beneficial. The Council needed to learn lessons from this experience for similar projects in future. With reference to the appendix of the report, he confirmed that the Highways team had reviewed the Audit report and embraced the final

recommendations. The team found the recommendations beneficial as it had allowed them to gather experience which could be used with similar projects in future. The Chairman informed the Committee that he had also attended the Audit and Accounts Committee and had found the debate very useful. He suggested that there were always lessons to be learned when completing any sort of project.

Individual Members raised the following issues in relation to the report:

- Asked if the final overspend had been known, would the Ely Bypass route been chosen. The Chairman commented that there had been more than one route option. These routes had been part of a consultation process where the route that had been chosen received overwhelming support. He believed that the route chosen was the correct option. He recognised that the route had taken longer and cost more money than initially forecast, but lessons had been learned by Officers at this Council.
- Suggested that pressure had been put on officers to move the project forward more quickly than they would have liked.
- That the Project Board had failed to report back to this Committee on both progress and the overspend of the project. He further suggested that this would have been resolved if an opposition member had been allocated a seat on this Board. He noted that there had been some governance issues and hoped that they would learn from this experience.
- Highlighted that the residents of Ely were pleased that the Ely Bypass had been completed as it had improved access to the city and reduce the amount of traffic in the city centre.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Consider the report and its recommendations; and
- b) Endorse the Internal Audit recommendation as set out in Appendix 1.

285. AGENDA PLAN, TRAINING PLAN AND APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

It was resolved to:

- a) Review its agenda plan attached as the Appendix to the report.
- b) Consider if any additional training is required for the Committee.

286. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING THURSDAY 14th November 2019

**Chairman:
14th November 2019**