

# Environment and Green Investment Committee

Date: 13 July 2023

Time: 10.00am – 12.30pm

Venue: New Shire Hall

Present: Councillors L Dupré (Chair), N Gay (Vice Chair), S Corney, P Coutts, I Gardener, J Gowing, R Hathorn, J King, P McDonald, B Milnes, C Rae, P Slatter (substituting for Cllr Bradnam), M Smith and T Sanderson (substituting for Cllr Ferguson)

## 138. Notification of Chair and Vice Chair

The Committee noted the appointment of Councillor Lorna Dupré as Chair of the Committee, and Councillor Nick Gay as Vice Chair for the municipal year 2023/24. These appointments were made by Council on 16<sup>th</sup> May 2023.

## 139. Apologies for Absence and Declarations of Interest

Apologies for absence were noted from Cllr A Bradnam (Cllr P Slatter substituting), Cllr S Ferguson (Cllr T Sanderson substituting) and Cllr S Tierney.

Officers Emma Fitch and Frank Jordan both declared non-pecuniary interests. Emma Fitch confirmed that she was a Director of Light Blue Fibre on behalf of the Council, and Frank Jordan confirmed that he was being appointed as the Cambridgeshire County Council's Shareholder Representative to this body, in relation to minute 150.

## 140. Public minutes of the Environment and Green Investment Committee meetings held 16 and 22 March 2023 and Action Log

The public minutes of the meetings held on 16 and 22 March 2023 were agreed as correct records of those meetings, and the action log was noted.

With regard to item 98 on the Action Log, it was confirmed that the workshop on the draft Interim Corporate Tree and Woodland Strategy would be organised for September 2023, and more details would be available shortly.

## 141. Petitions and Public Questions

No petitions or public questions were received.

## 142. Decarbonisation of council buildings

The Committee considered a report which proposed a change to the investment criteria for the Decarbonisation Fund.

Members noted that under the Low Carbon Heating Programme, 22 Air Source Heat Pumps (ASHPs) had been installed, to date, at County Council sites, with projects at six more sites underway. In order to realise the Council's Net Zero objective, ASHPs needed to be installed at the Council's remaining 33 sites that are still using gas or oil heating.

Since the report had been published, notification had been received that the Council's Low Carbon Skills Fund (LCSF) grant application, submitted in April 2023, had been unsuccessful. However, a further round of public sector decarbonisation scheme grants would be open to applications in the autumn. If successful, these could contribute a significant portion of costs to the decarbonisation projects, but the Council would still need to contribute towards the balance of the cost from the Decarbonisation Fund. The report sought to update the criteria for investment for the Decarbonisation Fund which sits within the Environment Fund and to include energy efficiency measures, such as LED lighting, as well as energy generation, in addition to low carbon heating systems. The benefits of extending the criteria were explained.

Arising from the report:

- it was confirmed that work on the scheme at Great Gidding School had commenced but had not been completed, and there were ongoing negotiations with the landlord of that site. There was potential to regain funding not yet spent, but if the Council did not complete the project and recovered money unspent to date, this may be cancelled out by the amount of grant funding the Council would need to pay back. Officers would report back as the negotiations progress;
- it was confirmed that this funding was not available to Academies. It was further noted that the report covered the Council's own buildings, excluding schools, as these were managed with a different set of criteria;
- a Member commented that one of her Parish Councils was currently debating how to progress with decarbonisation, and it would be helpful to have a seminar or online workshop for Parish Councils;
- a Member asked if the unsatisfactory bidding mechanisms, used by central government in relation to relevant grants, were likely to be reviewed. Officers advised that the Low Carbon Skills Fund was very quickly oversubscribed, which demonstrated the latent demand for such funding. The Public Sector Decarbonisation scheme related to capital funding, and the Council had been successful in securing these grants. A further round of funding would be coming forward in September. The report published by Chris Skidmore MP on Net Zero in March 2023 had highlighted the issue of Local Authorities competing for funding, and included an action for government to consider whether alternative funding mechanisms could be considered. For example, a consolidated funding pot to avoid continuous bidding processes for Local Authorities who put a lot of time and energy into this process. The other opportunity was whether future devolution deals with Government could bring an alternative framework for funding this type of work.

It was resolved unanimously to:

approve the revised investment criteria for the Decarbonisation Fund to include energy efficiency measures, solar PV installations and undertaking whole building retrofit works as set out in Option 1 in paragraph 2.16.

### 143. Heat Pump Ready Project – Friday Bridge, Fenland

Members received a report on a proposed pilot project aimed at supporting the installation of heat pumps in domestic properties.

“Heat Pump Ready” was a government programme which aimed to develop ways to overcome the barriers to the installation of domestic heat pumps, with the aim of achieving the national target of installing 600,000 domestic heat pumps per annum. The Council was part of a consortium which had been successful in securing up to £1.8M innovation grant funding to develop, demonstrate and evaluate a Council based, web based one stop shop to make domestic installation of heat pumps more accessible. Members noted the different phases of the project and what each phase would involve. They also noted the related timelines, and how the project would be funded, evaluated and reported back. The government required the project to demonstrate that heat pumps would be installed in at least 25% of homes. Friday Bridge had been identified as a suitable area in the Phase 1 feasibility study, due to the potential to alleviate fuel poverty in that community, and technical factors i.e. it was on the gas grid and the substations were not too large or heavily constrained.

The report sought approval for the procurement of contractors for the survey of homes, installation and design work, and the installation of domestic ASHPs in 2024. The Invitation to Tender had already been run as a mini-competition under a shared framework, but the award of that was dependent on Committee approval. Members were reassured that both contractors under consideration had been rigorously vetted.

Arising from the report:

- a Member observed that 25% was a very demanding target. Officers outlined the measures that were proposed to reach that target, but acknowledged that this was a challenging target. The measures included intensive local marketing through a website, door to door, and community engagement events. A particular benefit to prospective customers was the free survey and installation design;
- a Member asked about the capacity limit of the sub-stations. Officers advised they had worked with UKPN and identified Friday Bridge as an area less constrained in terms of sub-station capacity compared to other areas. Noting that fuel poverty was one of the criteria, the Member observed that ASHPs generally cost more to run than gas boilers. Officers explained that correctly designed and installed, ASHPs were, on average, broadly on parity with gas boilers in terms of running costs. The installation design process would provide residents with projected bill impacts for their property, enabling them to make informed decisions. Longer term, heat pumps should be cheaper to run as there was a commitment by government in their Powering Up Britain publication in March 2023 to rebalance gas and electricity costs;

- a Member observed that most companies did not charge customers for surveys and estimates, and she hoped that the subsequent installation costs of contractors would reflect that. It was confirmed that costs would be charged separately for the survey and installation works. The design works were significant and expensive, as a thermal loss assessment on each building needed to be undertaken. Members were reassured that the installer would not be effectively paid twice for doing that work.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) approve the procurement of an installation contractor as set out in section 2.7 and to delegate authority for awarding and executing a contract for the provision of surveys and heat pump installation work in Friday Bridge to the Executive Director Place and Sustainability, in consultation with the Chair/Vice Chair of Environment and Green Investment Committee;
- b) note that there will be a full review of the proposed project prior to proceeding to any installations;
- c) note that a report will be presented to the Committee in November 2023 on the results of that review together with a recommendation on whether to proceed with the project or not

#### 144. Local Energy System Transition

The Committee considered a report which set out proposals for Local Area Energy Planning in partnership with Cambridgeshire local authorities, the Combined Authority and UK Power Networks.

Officers outlined what a future smart energy system could look and feel like for individuals. It involved solar PV on roofs, connected to a battery to store excess electricity generation. This excess could then be used later or sold through a digital platform to others, neighbours or other users. At the same time, homes would need to be retrofitted with insulation to reduce energy demand and heating and hot water homes would shift to heat pumps and cut fossil fuels from gas and oil boilers. Heat pumps could also provide cooling as summers get hotter and EV chargepoints would be installed or with local access to charge electric vehicles. This will the energy system from gas, oil, petrol and diesel, the global market for fossil fuels, to clean electricity that can be generated locally, regionally and offshore but with greater security of supply. Energy security and resilience were very important for a thriving economy, and careful planning was needed to transform the energy system to be fit for purpose.

Four Local Area Energy Plans had been developed nationally. These pilots have demonstrated the importance of a planned approach to energy that brings together land use planning, grid scale planning, local generation, demand management and a digital system that can dynamically manage supply, demand, buying and selling of energy. It will also help inform and build the supply chain for delivery of the system changes.

Members noted the objectives and scope of the plan, which would be undertaken in partnership with local authority partners. The involvement of Local Authority Planning authorities was vital, for both investment and land use planning.

Arising from the report:

- a Member was delighted to see that the County Council was in the vanguard of this process, and he looked forward to the development of another LAEP. He spoke favourably about a development in South Wales, which was a local energy plan which provided renewable energy and battery storage, and also facilitated power being sold back to the grid;
- a Member asked about partnership working on this project, including those businesses which used a lot of energy. Officers confirmed that there was a technical process focusing on total future need, and the input of all stakeholders was required. Identifying major energy users was key to this process, as was involving communities and specialist landowners. For these reasons, a Stakeholder Plan would be one of the first actions. In terms of major energy users contributing to the process, if demand increased and stakeholders required more from the grid or distribution network, there was an associated cost, which everyone would pay. Key to the Local Area Energy Plan was putting communities at the heart of the plan to benefit from the transformation as it happens. Another clear benefit of this project was that it would provide an evidence base to attract inward investment, apply for grants and for discussions with government;
- noting that *“engaging communities and putting them at the heart of the plan”*, a Member asked how communities would be engaged in practice, specifically how they could communicate their views, especially if they had a scheme they wanted to progress. Officers confirmed that there were many communities approaching the Council on these issues, and the big challenge was identifying what those communities could do, what, how and where they could invest, and how the Council could support them in these actions. In most cases, a significant amount of technical work was required, so there was a need for analysis before determining the best plan of action. The Head of Energy Services had a community energy background and had worked on these types of projects, developing business plans and securing funding. In addition to those communities already approaching the Council, there were some communities that may need additional support to engage. Community energy was one area for collaboration but the mechanisms included working with energy companies who may want to invest in local infrastructure and collaborating with communities to secure benefit e.g. subsidising domestic retrofit projects. The Chair reminded Members that a Community Energy Policy had been agreed by the Committee in March 2023, and a Community Energy Strategy would be brought forward in the near future. In addition, the Communities, Social Mobility and Inclusion Committee had also approved a number of pilot decentralisation projects, including a project to decentralise decision on community energy in East Cambridgeshire;
- a Member asked if Housing Associations would be engaged as they were responsible for a large number of homes around the county. Officers gave the example of how the Housing Associations engaged with the Swaffham Prior project. 50 homes in the village were owned by two Social Housing providers and they committed to the scheme. Over time, tenants' homes would be connected to the heating scheme as they became ready. The officer agreed it was important to engage social housing providers in the development of the Local Area Energy Plan;
- a Member observed that the Swaffham Prior project used £10M of Public Works Loans Board funding at a time when interest rates were very low. The interest rate had now increased significantly, distorting the economics of these projects. In order to progress

these projects at scale in future, commitment was required by government. Officers agreed, noting that a £3M government grant was provided for the Swaffham Prior project and the remainder was borrowing. The high cost of loans was a problem for future projects, but this was countered by the higher tariffs now charged for heat sales. Moving forward, to support communities and wider stakeholders, pathways need to be developed that provide access to development funding and grants. It would be important to support this by helping to put together funding packages.

A minor change to recommendation (b) was agreed – delegate *authority*, and all Members indicated their agreement to this change.

It was resolved unanimously to:

a) comment on the draft outcomes and scope of the Local Area Energy Planning process as set out in paragraphs 2.6-2.8 of the report;

b) delegate authority for awarding and executing contracts for the provision of the specialist energy consultancy services, described in paragraph 2.9, and any extension periods to the Executive Director Place and Sustainability in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of Committee.

#### 145. Anglian Water Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant Relocation Project

The Committee received a report setting out the County Council's Relevant Representations in response to Anglian Water's proposals for the relocation of the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW).

Members noted that Relevant Representations was the first opportunity for a stakeholder to respond to an application, and the subsequent process was outlined in the report. A Development Consent Order was sought, so the application was going through the Planning Inspectorate, and would ultimately be determined by the Secretary of State for the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA). The County Council was classed as a host authority. Two particular actions for the County Council was an assessment of the adequacy of consultation undertaken, and the submission of a Local Impact Report, which would expand on the points raised in the Relevant Representations, which sets out the key issues. The Examination was a six month process, and early indications suggested that this may commence in the Autumn.

The Relevant Representations period ran from 14/06/23-19/07/23 and was open to all individuals and organisations. The three main areas covered in the Anglian Water proposal were:

1. The relocation of the WWTW from Cowley Road to north of A14 between Fen Ditton and Horningsea;
2. The pipeline from Waterbeach to the new site and/or existing site;
3. Decommissioning the existing site.

Relocation would allow for housing to be developed on the existing site, and this formed part of the ambition for the NE Cambridge development to deliver 8000 homes in that area. The new facility would be a low carbon facility and would capture gas which would feed into the national grid.

Delegated authority was already in place so that officers could meet the tight deadlines associated with the Development Consent Order process. The key points raised in the Relevant Representations were summarised.

Arising from the report:

- a Member noted the statement “*Sight of unredacted versions of relevant biodiversity and ecology related surveys*” – and asked if only redacted versions had been offered? It was noted the whole application was available publicly on the Planning Inspectorate’s website, but only redacted versions were available, for good reasons e.g. in relation to sensitive species. Officers were asking Anglian Water to share the unredacted version confidentially so that these could be assessed;
- a Member asked if maps could be included in similar reports in future, so that comments about the various locations referred to could be easily understood;
- a Member noted the reference to “stakeholders” in paragraph 4.5, and asked if that included local residents and environmental groups? It was confirmed that it was the Council’s view that the proposed advisory group should include local people and groups;
- a Member observed that there was a vigorous campaign group in Fen Ditton (“Save Honey Hill”), and the Parish Councils were being proactive in respect of this proposal;
- a Member observed that the officer team had done a good job in posing appropriate, wide-ranging questions in the Relevant Representations, and thanked the team for their work on this matter.

Local Member Cllr Daunton spoke on the report. Councillor Daunton advised that her Fulbourn division bordered Waterbeach, the proposed location of the WWTW. Communities in the Fulbourn division were directly affected by the proposal, specifically Quy, Fen Ditton East and Teversham, and also the neighbouring villages of the Wilbrahams. There continued to be much local concern over the proposed move, including representations by the “Save Honey Hill” group. Councillor Daunton commented on the following points in the report:

Biodiversity – the Applicant accepted the need to comply with the requirement for 20% biodiversity gain, and officers were right to press for more detail, e.g. a copy of the Biodiversity Net Gains spreadsheet and map. Whilst the Applicant’s message was that this was a plant for the 21<sup>st</sup> century, there needed to be greater reassurance on the biodiversity issues.

Carbon Capture – there was a concern that the new plant would not take full advantage of modern methods of carbon capture and achieve net zero, as highlighted in the report, especially around emissions.

Decommissioning arrangements – the report raised issues including emissions, the health of the local community, the impact of the ventilation stack, and the decontamination of the existing site. The report made it clear that further clarity was required on a number of aspects.

Highways and Transport issues - these had been raised at previous stages of the consultation processes. Local Members were disappointed that a new direct access route from the A14 was not being progressed, and it was absolutely crucial that the access aspects during and after construction were prioritised. The construction timetable, including vehicle movements, should be tracked and monitored. With regard to the A14 junction, additional lighting would be needed, and assessment of the impact of lighting on surrounding areas should be included. Residents had also raised concerns on the impact on busy cycling and walking route.

In general, more should be done to consider the adverse impact on local communities, including walkers, cyclists and equestrians. Whilst opening additional paths was welcomed, these would bring additional recreational visitors to the area, which would require parking provision, and Councillor Daunton asked that this was added to the comments.

Officers confirmed that on the lighting and biodiversity matters, there was already engagement with Anglian Water on these issues.

The Chair observed that there were limits around what could be discussed at this stage, as this was formed part of the planning process. The recommendation was to delegate to the Executive Director in consultation with the Committee Chair and Vice Chair, and Members' comments would be included, where feasible, in the final submission.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) endorse the draft Relevant Representations in Appendix 3 for submission to the Planning Inspectorate;
- b) delegate authority to the Executive Director of Place and Sustainability in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee to make minor changes to the Relevant Representations.

## 146. Corporate Performance Report

The Committee received an update on performance monitoring information, for the period up to the end of March 2023.

As part of continual development work, service directorate management teams continued to review the KPI list. This had led to the proposed removal of Indicator 25 - *Percentage of take up of new fibre broadband services delivered by the Connecting Cambridgeshire superfast broadband roll-out programme*, as this indicator related to a delivery contract which had now been closed. A new comparable Indicator was proposed, 24b - *the percentage of premises in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough with access to Gigabit capable broadband*. It was stressed that the new KPI related to *availability* of this increased capability, i.e. residents would not receive an automatic update to services.



Members' attention was drawn to Indicator 227, *Cambridgeshire county-wide carbon footprint (tonnes CO2e per year)*, which was still showing 2020 data. The 2021 data had been published and was being analysed, and would be included in future reports.

Arising from the report:

- a Member asked about Indicator 150b, *Cambridgeshire recycling, reuse, composting and recovery rate (12 month rolling total)*. The Member noted that Fenland's recycling rate was considerably lower than the other Districts, which was probably attributable to Fenland charging for the collection of green waste. Officers advised they would circulate a note on the link between policy and recycling rates. **Action required.** Another Member observed that recycling performance was based on weight, and often high recycling rates could indicate high volumes of green waste;
- a Member queried the break in the data for Indicator 24a in December 2020. Officers advised that they knew of no specific reason for the break in data, but the data from November 2020 and January 2021 indicated that figures were very stable;
- a Member asked about fleet vehicle emissions and fugitive refrigerant gases. Officers advised that there had been a slight increase in fugitive refrigerant gas emissions in 2021/22, and that these figures were based on servicing reports for Air Conditioning and fridges, and that servicing might not happen every year. Officers were looking at different methodologies that could be used to provide more robust baseline data. With regard to fleet vehicle emissions, no information was yet available for 2022-23, so this data needed to be identified, and an update provided to a future Committee meeting.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) review and agree the proposed addition to/removal from the Environment and Green Investment Committee Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) set;
- b) note and comment on the performance information provided and associated actions required

#### 147. Finance Monitoring Report – Outturn 2022-23

The Committee reviewed the Finance Monitoring Outturn position for 2022-23. Members noted the £415K overspend across Place & Sustainability overspend, which was in line what was forecast during the year. On the Capital side, there had been £1M less slippage than forecast (£5.7M at year end compared to the £6.7M forecast).

It was resolved unanimously to:

- review, note and comment on the report.

#### 148. Finance Monitoring Report – May 2023

Members reviewed the May 2023 Finance Monitoring Report. On the Revenue side, there was a forecast pressure £3.66M on energy services budgets, where longer lead in times had resulted in a delay to income streams coming on line.

On the Capital side, there was a £1.9M pressure on North Angle Farm, and the Committee was being asked to approve the carry forwards as listed.

A Member asked if the £3.66M on the energy services budgets was due to a phasing issue. It was confirmed that there was a delay to the income stream starting, but the budget was correct and the income should be received. This did not reflect a long term problem, and additional project resources were putting in to manage the project. However, updates would continue to be provided to the Committee as it was such a significant revenue issue.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- i. endorse the proposed carry-forwards / re-profiling / funding changes in the Capital Programme to Strategy & Resources Committee for approval;
- ii. review and comment on the report

#### 149. Cross border use of Thriplow and Royston Household Recycling Centres

Members considered a report on proposed arrangements for Household Recycling Centres (HRCs) located near the border between Cambridgeshire and Hertfordshire, specifically the Thriplow HRC, run by Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC), and the Royston HRC, run by Hertfordshire County Council (HCC).

The Committee was reminded that there were statutory duties for local authorities to provide facilities at which persons resident in its area may deposit their household waste. HCC had agreed to restrict access to its sites to Hertfordshire residents only unless there was reciprocal access and/or cost sharing arrangements with any neighbouring local authority. Whilst CCC sites were intended for Cambridgeshire residents, this was not actively enforced e.g. through a booking system, meet and greet staff or similar arrangement. HCC research had demonstrated that Cambridgeshire residents used the Royston HRC more frequently than Hertfordshire residents use Thriplow HRC. Estimates of costs and impacts were listed in a confidential appendix to the report. If cross border arrangements were not agreed, and residents were redirected, this could create additional costs for both this Council and residents.

Arising from the report:

- a Member observed that a booking system, whilst unpopular, was a good way to obtain accurate data on usage, and asked what alternative methods were being considered. Officers advised that some form of recording visits was required e.g. permits to use the respective sites, and the purpose of the report was to obtain Members' permission to further explore these issues and develop a joint system with HCC, as HCC was asking for figures to be based on actual usage;
- it was confirmed that whatever system was used, the intention was to avoid materially discouraging people from using their nearest sites.

Councillor McDonald, speaking as a Local Member, advised that local residents were very grateful for officer work, especially as they had struggled with HRC restrictions during the Covid period.

Members noted written representations from Local Members Councillors van de Ven and Kindersley, set out in Appendix 1 to these minutes.

One Member commented that it was regrettable that HCC had chosen to go down this route, as whilst it may result in a slight financial gain, this was at the cost of considerable officer resource. He further observed that this issue impacted on all county border areas, and would surely result in a zero sum gain.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) approve the principle of exploring and implementing a reciprocal access and cost sharing arrangements with Hertfordshire County Council, as outlined in sections 2 and 3 of this report and in the confidential Appendix 1, to not disadvantage Cambridgeshire and Hertfordshire residents from using the nearest recycling centre to their homes in the Thriplow and Royston areas;
- b) delegate authority to the Executive Director of Place and Sustainability, in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair, to make a final decision on implementing a reciprocal arrangement with Hertfordshire County Council;
- c) delegate authority to the Executive Director of Place and Sustainability to procure research to quantify the use of the County Council Household Recycling Centre sites by residents from all neighbouring councils, and the use of neighbouring councils' sites by Cambridgeshire residents to estimate the associated costs and impacts to the Cambridgeshire taxpayers to inform a future update to this Committee

## 150. Light Blue Fibre Annual Progress Report

Members considered an update on the progress of the Light Blue Fibre Joint Venture Company between Cambridgeshire County Council and the University of Cambridge.

The purpose of Light Blue Fibre was to market the fibre assets of the University and the Council on a commercial basis. This was in line with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Digital Infrastructure Strategy, which highlighted the extent to which the Council's aims for sustainability, fairness and economically strong Cambridgeshire were reliant on good digital connectivity. Fibre ducting was used to carry fibre optic cables which form the basis of high speed fibre broadband, which was the underpinning infrastructure required for all forms of digital connectivity – whether fixed (e.g. home or business broadband) or 4G and 5G mobile services. Additionally, the venture provided a modest financial gain for the Council.

In response to a Member question, it was confirmed that the Light Blue Fibre programme covered the whole of Cambridgeshire.

The Chair and other Members praised both the report and the excellent programme.

It was resolved unanimously to note the progress of the Light Blue Fibre company over the last year, as set out in the report and the confidential appendix.

## 151. Environment and Green Investment Committee Appointments to Outside Bodies and Internal Advisory Groups and Panels

The Committee considered appointments to outside bodies and internal advisory groups and panels.

In discussion, the following points were noted:

- Councillor W Hunt would be appointed to the Dimmocks Cote Liaison Group;
- Councillor E Meschini was replacing Councillor Bulat on the London Stansted Corridor Consortium Board, as per the schedule;
- Councillor S Ferguson would be appointed to the Natural Cambridgeshire vacancy, and the Farms Working Group Independent vacancy, subject to confirmation;
- It was confirmed that Cllr Goldsack was a Member of the Farms Working Group.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- 1) review the appointments to outside bodies as detailed in Appendix 1;
- 2) review the appointments to Internal Advisory Groups and Panels as detailed in Appendix 2.

## 152. Environment and Green Investment Committee Agenda Plan

Members reviewed the Committee Agenda Plan.

It was resolved unanimously to note the agenda plan.

## 153. Exclusion of Press and Public

It was resolved that the press and public be excluded from the meeting on the grounds that the agenda contains exempt information under Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, and that it would not be in the public interest for this information to be disclosed - information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

## 154. Northstowe Phase 1 Section 106 Agreement Cost Cap

The Committee considered a report on the Northstowe Phase 1 section 106 agreement.

It was resolved, by a majority, to agree the recommendations set out in the report.

Cross border use of Thriplow and Royston Household Recycling Centres (Item 149) – Local Member comments

Comments from Cllr van de Ven:

*“Thank you very much to all concerned for trying to find a common-sense solution for recycling centre access for residents in the south of South Cambridgeshire. Access to Royston Recycling Centre, owned and operated by Herts County Council, is many miles closer than Thriplow or Milton. From the copious feedback I’ve had from residents in the Melbourn and Bassingbourn Division, I can confidently say there is 100% support for the recommendation – which therefore I fully support. I would also like to note widespread appreciation of local residents in the continued availability of access to Royston Recycling Centre during this interim period.”*

Comments from Cllr Kindersley:

*“A number of my Parishes will be very relieved to see this recommendation and I would be very grateful if the Committee could support it. Guilden Morden, Steeple Morden, Litlington are some of my Division Parishes that are all considerably closer to Royston than Thriplow; and the environmental impact of residents being forced to use Thriplow rather than Royston would have been substantial.*

*Please would you also thank officers who I know have been working very hard to come to a satisfactory conclusion on this?”*