

# Environment and Green Investment Committee

Date: 1 July 2021

Time: 10.05am – 1.05pm

Venue: Bluntisham Village Hall

Present: Councillors L Dupré (Chair), N Gay (Vice-Chair), A Bradnam, S Corney, S Count (substituting for Cllr I Gardener), P Coutts, S Ferguson, M Goldsack, J Gowing, R Hathorn, J King, B Milnes, C Rae, M Smith and S Tierney

## 1. Notification of the appointment of Chair and Vice Chair

It was resolved to note the appointment of Councillor Lorna Dupré as Chair and Councillor Nick Gay as Vice Chair of the Environment & Green Investment Committee for the municipal year 2021/22.

## 2. Apologies for Absence and Declarations of Interest

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Gardener (Councillor Count substituting).

There were no declarations of interest.

## 3. a) Minutes of the Environment & Sustainability Committee

The minutes of the meeting held on 11th March 2021 were agreed as a correct record.

## b) Environment and Sustainability Committee Action Log

The Action Log was noted.

With regard to the Swaffham Prior, it was noted that the project was progressing well and that two key contracts have been signed and further contracts would be signed shortly.

## 4. Petitions and Public Questions

No petitions or public questions were received.

## 5. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan document (Version for Adoption)

The Committee considered a report on the proposed adoption of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan. The review of the Plan had commenced in 2017 in line with the Council's adopted local development scheme timetable. Following public consultation at several points in the Plan preparation process over the last few years, including an Examination in Public in September 2020, the Council needed to decide whether to adopt the Minerals and Waste Local Plan as part of its major policy framework. Subject to this agreement, and similar agreement being provided by Peterborough City Council at their Cabinet and Council meetings, adoption of the Plan would give the Council a robust and up to date policy document for making decisions on Minerals and Waste planning matters and directing minerals and waste operations to the most appropriate and sustainable locations. The Plan would also provide certainty and clarity for minerals and waste operators across Cambridgeshire.

It was noted that the Inspector's comments were binding, meaning that the Council could not be selective in the modifications it accepted. Each Council had to accept them all if the two councils wish to adopt the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, or, reject them all, and, therefore not adopt the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. One Council could not adopt the Plan if the other did not. In the event that the Plan was not adopted, the process to prepare a new Plan would need to re-commence following the same cycle of extensive data collection. If adopted, the linked Policies Map would also need updating: this covered the relevant city or district Local Plan and any Neighbourhood Plans falling in its area. Adoption was therefore not sought for the Policies Map as a static document, because it would be a live document subject to change.

It was noted that there was a six-week timescale post adoption whereby an aggrieved party could legally challenge the adoption of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Should this occur, officers would notify Members. Given the amount of engagement and communications, including the involvement of both local communities and the minerals and waste industry in the process (including the Examination in Public), it was envisaged that the risk of challenge was low. Additionally, the Inspector was satisfied that the Council had undertaken appropriate, and legally required, consultation throughout this process, which was referenced in his report, and he had noted the evidence demonstrated close working with neighbouring minerals and waste planning authorities, that effective relationships had been maintained with all the bodies listed in the relevant legislation; and acknowledged that many of the pre-submission changes brought forward resulted from consultation with relevant parties to address their concerns in a constructive and active manner.

It was noted that the Plan had been informed by the Council's climate change aspirations and was well placed to deliver on the green agenda, with such schemes as landscape scale restoration proposals such as the complementary habitat for the Ouse Washes (including flood storage opportunities) proposed at Block Fen/Langwood Fen.

Looking ahead, the Council had to legally review the Plan within five years of adoption. Options for the timing and content of such a review would be subject to future reports to this Committee.

Arising from the report:

- A number of Members thanked officers for the comprehensive report;
- A Member was pleased to note that with reference to the benefits of co-location of waste management sites, the report specified that such benefits would need to be considered on a case-by-case basis, and the policy should not be read as a blanket approval for further waste management extensions or new sites or facilities, on the basis that a waste site already existed in the area;
- A number of Members were pleased to note the provision to protect deep peat.

It was resolved unanimously to:

a) note the conclusions of the independent Inspector who was appointed to examine the submitted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

b) recommend to Full Council the adoption of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan, incorporating modifications as recommended by the Inspector ('Main Modifications') and other minor editorial modifications ('Additional Modifications'), as attached at Appendix B, subject to recommendation (f).

c) note that should Full Council adopt the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, the following council documents are revoked and must not be used for decision making:

- Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011); and
- Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals (2012).

d) subject to recommendation b), recommends that Full Council endorses that the Cambridgeshire 'Policies Map' be updated in accordance with the draft maps as published during the examination of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, as included at Appendix D;

e) agree to revoke the following two Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) for decision making purposes in the Cambridgeshire area, but only if Full Council does adopt the new Plan under Recommendation b), and with such revocation only taking effect from the same date that the new Plan is adopted:

- Location and Design of Waste Management Facilities SPD (2011); and
- Block Fen / Langwood Fen Master Plan SPD (2011).

f) recommend to Full Council that recommendation b) only comes into effect if Peterborough City Council has already agreed to adopt the Plan; or, if that agreement is not yet achieved by Peterborough City Council, recommendation b) comes into effect from the date that Peterborough City Council does agree to adopt the Plan. If Peterborough City Council agree not to adopt the Plan, then recommendations b) to e) become null and void;

g) delegate to the Business Manager, County Planning, Minerals and Waste and / or Assistant Director, Planning, Growth and Environment, in consultation with

colleagues at Peterborough City Council, to make any minor presentational or typographical errors to the documents referred in this item, prior to their publication.

## 6. Investment Decision, St Ives Park and Ride Smart Energy Grid

The Committee considered a report seeking approval for the investment case for the St Ives Park and Ride Smart Energy Grid project, and approval to enter into a Funding Agreement for a grant.

The background to the project was explained, including:

- The problems with small and medium sized energy generation schemes in terms of paying upgrade costs which are high to connect to the distribution network run by UK Power Networks (UKPN);
- The business model developed is to generate and supply renewable electricity directly to local businesses via a private wire to avoid the grid upgrade costs;
- The background to the project in terms of Committee approvals and grant applications, and the conditions on those grants;
- The logistical difficulties currently being experienced by the project in terms of supply chain issues, mainly as a result of the pandemic, including purchasing steel, and the small windows for decision making due to price volatility of key materials;
- The total capital cost of the project was just over £4m, and the grant funding potentially available is 50% of this. However, a “gap funding” calculation that takes account of future net income produced by the project will reduce the figure we can claim. The business case currently includes estimated grant funding of approximately £1.6m. Discussions with MHCLG are continuing to see if any improvement could be made on this;
- That the Net Present Value (NPV) of the project was currently around zero, if Carbon is excluded from the calculations, but was £0.8m if Carbon was included.

The Committee noted comments in support of the project from Local Member Councillor Kevin Reynolds.

Arising from the report:

- Members noted the prohibitive costs of connecting to the Grid for small and medium sized projects in areas, the merits of the ‘private wire’ approach, and the related issues around battery storage for surplus energy generated;
- Members noted that in terms of the ‘Carbon included’ projections, the government valued carbon based on what the cost to the country would be of removing carbon in future years. This cost has been increasing sharply and

would continue to do so over the next 20 years, so whilst the project would not result in a cash saving for the Council, there were wider benefits. It was noted that future price of carbon would be heavily dependent on decisions by the government, such as Carbon Credits, and that a report would be considered by the Committee at a future meeting on the potential for local carbon trading schemes;

- In response to a Member query, it was confirmed that the business case did not include embedded carbon costs e.g. the costs of transporting solar panels from other countries.

Councillor Count congratulated the team for all the hard work that had gone into both the report and the project, and expressed strong support for the proposal. He pointed out that the previous administration had put forward an amendment in the Business Plan for £16M to support environmental measures. He outlined the considerable investment in schools and other schemes, but observed that all of the “low hanging fruit” in terms of energy schemes were now in the pipeline. Whilst supportive of the project, he commented that it was unusual to have an open-ended arrangement. For that reason, he was proposing an amendment to the report recommendations to cap the maximum delegation to 5%, and to require an additional Committee meeting to take place if the figures changed substantially:

*(addition to Recommendation (d) (in bold text) plus additional recommendations (e) and (f)):*

“(d) delegate the following decisions to the Executive Director of Place and Economy and Director of Resources, in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of Environment & Green Investment Committee and in accordance with the approved investment case for the Project, **subject to a maximum delegation of 5% decrease in overall financial outturn:**

- i) to sign the Power Purchase Agreements with Customers; and
- ii) issue a Notice to Proceed (NTP) to Bouygues based on best available final costs

(e) Should the 5% limit in (d) above be exceeded; to call an emergency committee meeting to debate final approvals

(f) Subject to the approval of all of the above: Approach the next meeting of the Strategy & Resources Committee with an application for the shortfall in funding, the amount as set out in the confidential papers.”

Councillor Count’s amendment was seconded by Councillor Smith.

Councillor Dupré proposed the following amendment to Councillor Count’s amendment.

“(d) delegate the following decisions to the Executive Director of Place and Economy and Director of Resources, in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of Environment & Green Investment Committee and in accordance with the approved investment case for the Project, **subject to the project continuing to demonstrate an acceptable net present value:**

- i) to sign the Power Purchase Agreements with Customers; and

ii) issue a Notice to Proceed (NTP) to Bouygues based on best available final costs.”

And deletion of additional recommendations (e) and (f).

Councillor Dupré’s amendment was seconded by Councillor Bradnam.

Speaking to her amendment, Councillor Dupré commented that Councillor Count’s amendment did not give the Council or officers sufficient flexibility, against a climate of increased volatility of costs and economic uncertainty. Additionally, holding an emergency meeting was unrealistic when officers had advised that materials prices were only being held for a maximum period of one week, so recommendation (e) was not viable, especially as it was particularly difficult to call emergency Committee meetings when the Council was without its own meeting room facilities, and the uncertainty of ongoing Covid-19 measures. She felt that recommendation (f) should be deleted as this would be done automatically.

A number of Members expressed concern that the reference in Councillor Dupré’s amendment to “acceptable Net Present Value” was vague and not widely understood, and that there was a danger that decisions would be made behind closed doors without the opportunity for public scrutiny. They argued that Councillor Count’s amendment had been clear that any variance of greater than 5% would need to be considered by the Committee. It was pointed out that the proposed 5% was based on an overall net outturn, and that £2M of the total £4M estimated cost was already sunk. Of the £2M left to be spent, the proportion of variable costs for items such as materials was relatively low, so 5% was in practice a generous margin, effectively representing a much more substantial increase in those costs. With regard to the additional recommendation (f) in the original amendment, it was suggested that whilst this may be a “tidying up exercise”, it was common practice within the Council to capture those decisions in the recommendations.

A Member observed that Councillor Count’s amendment could fundamentally impact on the Council’s commitment to the project, and asked what would happen in practice in that event. It was noted that the decision would need to be taken by an emergency meeting of the Committee, and it was observed that arranging meetings at short notice was particularly problematic currently, with virtual meetings no longer being an option, and the Council relying on the availability and suitability of external venues. A number of Members commented that Councillor Count’s amendment, particularly the arbitrary 5% cap, could put the project in jeopardy.

Some Members commented that Councillor Count’s amendment was effectively providing checks and balances to ensure that the project stayed on track financially, whilst still providing a good degree of flexibility. It was noted that the market for the materials required was currently very volatile, and this was exacerbated by tight deadlines for applications for government funding.

A number of Members commented that given the Council’s commitment to addressing Climate Change, coupled with increasing costs, it was vital that this project was progressed, and it would be instrumental in enabling future projects to come forward.

There was a request for a recorded vote on Councillor Dupré's amendment (See appendix 1). The amendment was carried.

Councillor Count commented that this was a vital project and his amendment did not seek to stop or delay it, but avoid an "open chequebook" approach. He continued to support the project and would support Councillor Dupré's amendment

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) note the background and progress with the project;
- b) approve the investment case for the St Ives Park and Ride Smart Energy Grid project as set out in section 2.3 of the report; and
- c) approve entering into a Funding Agreement with the European Regional Development Fund Managing Agent, Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) for up to £2,006,873 grant for the St. Ives Smart Energy Grid Project;
- d) delegate the following decisions to the Executive Director of Place and Economy and Director of Resources, in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of Environment & Green Investment Committee and in accordance with the approved investment case for the Project, subject to the project continuing to demonstrate an acceptable net present value:
  - i) to sign the Power Purchase Agreements with Customers; and
  - ii) issue a Notice to Proceed (NTP) to Bouygues based on best available final costs

*With the Committee's agreement, the Chairman agreed to bring forward the "Climate Change and Environment Strategy and the Environment Fund" as the next item.*

## 8. Climate Change and Environment Strategy and the Environment Fund

The Committee considered a report detailing the proposed strategy to move forward the Net Zero target for the Council and align spending and investment decisions to deliver Net Zero and Doubling Nature, as set out in the Joint Administration Agreement.

Introducing the report, officers reminded Members that the Council had declared a Climate Change emergency in 2019, based on the evidence from Cambridge researchers who had assessed Cambridgeshire's carbon footprint and on work undertaken in-house on the Council's carbon footprint. The Climate Change and Environment Strategy had been developed to address these issues, and the actions taken to date were noted e.g. removing fossil fuel boilers and improving resilience to climate change such as flooding.

There had been some significant changes in legislation and policy since that time, including an Independent Commission for Climate Change that had reported to the Combined Authority Board. Members noted that the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough

Independent Commission for Climate Change had identified that for the region per capita emissions were 25% higher on average and this needed to be addressed. The report outlined the targets that had been set, mostly focusing on carbon reduction measures and adaptations, how the Council was engaging with communities and businesses on the Climate Change agenda, and gave a snapshot of how some of the £16M Environment Fund had been spent.

Whilst the Strategy had been in place for a year, it needed to be updating to reflect changes in legislation and policy. Another key consideration going forward was how the process would be resourced.

A Member welcomed the report, but asked what exactly the wording of recommendation (b) *“to bring forward the net zero target towards 2030”* meant in practice. Officers explained that there were a number of Climate Change and Environment targets and commitments that had been made by the County Council, including a broad, Cambridgeshire-wide target to be net zero carbon by 2050, in collaboration with businesses and communities; a target to reduce the Council’s “scope 3” emissions to 50.4% of 2018 levels by 2030 through the Council’s procurement, and a target for a 50% reduction by 2023 on the Council’s scope 1 and 2 emissions. A pledge in the strategy also included that all Council buildings and transport to be fossil fuel free by 2025. In relation to the first of those commitments, to make Cambridgeshire net zero carbon by 2050, there were already discussions taking place about how that target could be brought forward i.e. be achieved at an earlier date. However, any such change to the target needed to consider the available evidence and be science based. The Member asked if that included the target to reduce “Scope 3” emissions by 2030, i.e. reduce emissions to zero rather than by 50.4% of the 2018 levels. Officers advised that it would be challenging to achieve.

The Member suggested that the recommendation as it was currently written, to “bring forward the net-zero target towards 2030” was not sufficiently ambitious, and he suggested that it be reworded to build on the previous administration’s ambitious achievements and targets in this area. Officers commented that there was a need to review the evidence and Government’s new accounting methodology which now also included emissions from peatland. This would result in changes to the work produced by CUSPE in early 2019. The implications need to be understood, especially in relation to the Council’s landholdings, and the support provided for business and communities.

There was a question on the environmental credentials of the new Alconbury Weald site, specifically the building specification, transport, etc. It was noted that there had been an excellent presentation to Member recently on this issue, and it was agreed to share this information. **Action required.**

A Member observed that there was a wide range of bodies and projects working on environmental issues, especially in the fens, and asked if the Review would explore how these fitted together. Officers confirmed that alignment across all organisations was crucial, in addition to supporting businesses and communities. One of the main recommendations from the CUSPE project was that unless all parties and policies aligned, it would be much more difficult to achieve the desired position.

Councillor Count proposed an amendment to recommendation (b):

Approve a review of the Climate Change and Environment Strategy to bring forward **define** the net-zero target towards **achievable by** 2030 and alignment of key resources by December 2021, as set out in paragraph 4.2 of the report

Councillor Count's amendment was seconded by Councillor Smith. Councillor Count commented that it was unclear what "bring forward to 2030" in the original recommendation meant. He added that the Scope 3 element, requiring providers to be net zero by 2030, would inevitably have significant cost implications, and that needed to be understood.

The Chair commented that she was not comfortable with the amendment which was simply setting a target date, adding that the Council needed to be more ambitious, and move every target as far forward as possible. A number of Members spoke in support of these comments, noting that it was an ambitious review to determine what was achievable on the basis of evidence, recognising the global climate emergency was an extremely serious situation, and every effort should be made to reduce carbon emissions, especially from fossil fuels. One Member commented that Councillor Count's amendment sought to quantify the Council's ambitions with regard to Climate Change and the environment in clear and understandable terms.

There was a request for a recorded vote on Councillor Count's amendment (See appendix 1). The amendment fell.

One Member commented that he had different views on environmental issues to most of the Committee. He was concerned that whilst the environmental objectives were clearly desirable, there would be widespread discontent and opposition from the public when the impact of the changes required hit home on the poorest sector of society, who could not afford it. He was concerned as this would have a huge impact on the people the Council served, and this needed to be mitigated going forward. In response, one Member highlighted that those who could least afford it would suffer the worst impacts of Climate Change, and the cost of decarbonisation escalated the longer it was left.

It was resolved, by a majority, to:

- a) Note the Council's progress delivering the May 2020 approved Climate Change and Environment Strategy
- b) Approve a review of the Climate Change and Environment Strategy to bring forward the net-zero target towards 2030 and alignment of key resources by December 2021, as set out in paragraph 4.2 of the report;
- c) Approve the development of a 'Routemap to Net-Zero and Doubling Nature' Programme including a medium-term resourcing strategy by March 2022.

## 7. Low Carbon Lifecycle Heating Replacements at Maintained Schools

Members received a report proposing a new finance mechanism for decarbonising heating in the Council's maintained schools to reduce the Council's carbon footprint. This report set out a number of potential funding sources, which included both grant and

loan finance. It also proposed ways to mitigate potential increases in energy bills resulting from the installation of Air Source Heat Pumps (ASHP), such as LED lighting and Solar PV Panels.

In addition to the proposed funding model, the Committee's views were sought on six schools where there was an urgent need for heating replacement. Failure to replace heating systems at those schools this summer could result in the failure of boilers and potentially temporary school closures, if the schools were without heating in the winter. Officers had just received notification that the Council may be eligible for between £100,000 and £200,000 from the Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme toward those six schools. Unfortunately, the timelines for ASHPs at those schools would not be ready for the winter. The total cost for those six schools was £940,000 over and above the cost of boiler replacement. The remaining funding could be drawn down from the Council's Environment Fund, but the scheme costs would significantly exceed the carbon savings those projects would deliver.

Under this funding model approach, the decision to proceed with ASHPs would still remain with the school; an alternative approach might be to simply increase the capital contribution that the Council makes, so there was no loan element to funding. The challenge with this approach was that, unlike the investments in the Council's offices from the Environment Fund, the energy bill saving benefits would accrue to the schools rather than the Council.

It was noted that decarbonisation grants were oversubscribed very quickly, and a £30,000 development budget was sought to enable projects to be developed to a stage to allow grant applications to be submitted as soon as application windows open. There was also a proposal for a service for academy schools to buy support to help secure grant funding.

A Member asked where the remainder funding for the six urgent schools would come from, if the application for the £100,000 and £200,000 from the Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme was unsuccessful. Officers advised that they had only just been advised of this unallocated funding, and if an application was submitted, it would be sufficient to cover one or two schools. The balance would need to come from £16M Environment Fund, which was effectively borrowing to deliver low carbon heating, EV charging points, etc. It was noted that there was currently around £10M unallocated in the Environment Fund. It was noted that *Maintained* schools were part of the Council's Carbon Footprint.

In response to a Member question, it was confirmed that ASHPs and Ground Source Heat Pumps (GSHPs) worked at higher efficiency in well insulated buildings, and that running costs were higher in poorly insulated buildings. Whilst ASHPs and GSHPs were energy saving, they could cost more to run because electricity was more expensive than gas. Combining ASHP/GSHP projects with LED lighting, solar PV, etc, could provide net savings over a longer period.

It was clarified that the £12.5M Environment Fund figures referred to in paragraph 2.6.4 was incorrect, it should read £13.5M, which was made up of £10M remaining Environment Fund, plus £3.5M Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme. It was

confirmed that there was a pipeline for some of the £10M and an estimate could be provided. Action required.

In response to a Member question, it was confirmed that the six schools identified in the report, plus another eleven, would be delivered over the next three years.

It was confirmed that assumptions on gas prices were based on market estimates of long term gas prices.

A Member asked what would happen if a Maintained school, benefitting from energy investment, became an Academy. It was noted that the loan element would be novated to the academy trust, but there would still be a broader benefit in terms of the county's carbon footprint. On a related question on the investment in Academies, officers advised that the arrangement with academies was an operating lease arrangement, so capital and borrowing costs were covered, with the Council generating a small surplus on top which covers Climate Change & Energy Investment Unit staff costs.

One Member commented that the issue of insulation was critical, and whilst the Council was doing its best generate and have a robust grid that could supply the county's energy needs, more attention should be given to insulation, and in particular retrofitting insulation, when appropriate. A number of Members agreed with this point, suggesting that more should be done with regard to insulation for schools, highlighting a number of cases where the fabric of schools was very poor.

A Member commented that he was not comfortable with the idea that the proposed investment may lead to increased costs for schools, and he felt there needed to be greater mitigation e.g. through insulation. He also felt that there should be a more ambitious commitment to decarbonising the heating in more schools than currently planned.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) a new funding model and investment criteria for projects involving decarbonisation of heating at maintained schools as set out in para 2.6.2; and
- b) the facility to draw down £30k of development budget for such projects from the Environment Fund; and
- c) offering a paid for service to academy schools to draft applications for grants for them to decarbonise their heating.
- d) Learning and experience with this proposed approach is reported back to Committee in 12 months' time along with any recommendations for change.

## 9. Finance Monitoring Report

The Committee received the Finance Monitoring report for the Place and Economy directorate.

The forecast showed a bottom-line revenue underspend of £162K, due to Street Lighting, as energy prices had increased by less than the budgeted uplift. However, services continued to experience significant pressures due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

The capital position identified the proposed updates to budgets (from that previously agreed as part of Business Planning) to reflect carry-forwards from the previous year, revised phasing and new funding. The changes on a scheme by scheme basis were detailed in the report, and Committee was requested to confirm support for these changes so they could be considered by the Strategy & Resources Committee for approval.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Note the Finance and Monitoring report and to confirm the updated Capital Budgets to be taken to Strategy & Resources Committee for approval

## 10. Appointments to Outside Bodies and Internal Advisory Groups and Panels

The committee received a report detailing the Committee's Agenda and Training Plan as well as their Appointments to Outside Bodies and Working Groups.

With regard to the Anglian (North) Regional Flood & Coastal Committee, it was noted that Cambridgeshire County Council shared a seat with Peterborough City Council, with this seat rotating yearly. For 2020-21 Cambridgeshire held the seat, and therefore the voting rights for would be for Peterborough City Council in 2021-22. However, all Councillors were always welcomed and encouraged to attend the meetings as an observer in the years that they do not hold the voting right.

A number of proposed appointments were noted, and there were a number still to be confirmed. The latest appointments position is appended to these minutes (Appendix 2).

It was resolved unanimously to:

- (i) review and agree the appointments to outside bodies as detailed in Appendix 2 to these minutes;
- (ii) review and agree the appointments to Internal Advisory Groups and Panels, as detailed in Appendix 2 to these minutes;
- (iii) delegate, on a permanent basis between meetings, the appointment of representatives to any vacancies on outside bodies, groups and panels, within the remit of the Environment & Green Investment Committee, to the Director, Place and Economy in consultation with the Chair, Environment & Green Investment Committee.

## Recorded votes on amendments

Councillor	Item 6 – Councillor Dupré’s amendment	Item 8 – Councillor Count’s amendment
A Bradnam	For	Against
S Corney	Against	For
S Count	Against	For
P Coutts	For	Against
L Dupré	For	Against
S Ferguson	For	Against
N Gay	For	Against
M Goldsack	Against	For
J Gowing	Against	For
R Hathorn	For	Against
J King	Against	For
B Milnes	For	Against
C Rae	For	Against
M Smith	Against	For
S Tierney	Against	Abstain

Appendix 2: Appointments to Outside bodies

Name of Body	Meetings per annum	Number of representatives	Appointments made at E&GI on 01/07/21	Contact details	Guidance classification
<p><b>Anglian (Northern) Regional Flood and Coastal Committee</b></p> <p>Cambridgeshire shares a seat on this Committee with Peterborough City Council and Rutland County Council. There will be an update at the Committee meeting whether Cambridgeshire occupies this shared seat for the year 2021-22, or is an observer. The RFCC however encourages all members (whether they are able to vote or not) to attend all Committee meetings.</p>	4 – 5	1	<b>Councillor D Connor (Con)</b>	<p>RFCC Secretariat Programme Team Ceres House Searby Road Lincoln LN2 4DT</p> <p><a href="mailto:AnglianNorthernRFCC@environment-agency.gov.uk">AnglianNorthernRFCC@environment-agency.gov.uk</a></p>	
<p><b>Cambridge Airport Consultative Committee</b></p> <p>The purpose of the Consultative Committee is to provide an effective forum for discussion about all matters concerning the operation and development of Cambridge Airport.</p>	3	1	<b>Councillor N Gay (Lab)</b>	<p>Terry Holloway Managing Director The Cambridge Aero Club The Airport CAMBRIDGE CB5 8RX</p> <p>01223 373227</p> <p><a href="mailto:TH@Marcamb.co.uk">TH@Marcamb.co.uk</a></p>	Other Public Body representative
<p><b>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Flood &amp; Water Partnership</b></p> <p>The partnership is required by legislation - namely the Flood and Water Management Act 2010.</p>	4	1	<p><b>Councillor L Dupré (LD)</b></p> <p><b>Observer –</b></p> <p><b>Councillor G Wilson (LD)</b></p>	<p>Hilary Ellis/Quinton Carroll Flood and Water Business Manager</p> <p>07500 063286 / 07717 426713</p> <p><a href="mailto:Hilary.ellis@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">Hilary.ellis@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a></p>	Other Public Body representative

<p><b>Conservators of the River Cam</b></p> <p>The Conservators are the statutory navigation authority for Cambridge between the Mill Pond in Silver Street to Bottisham Lock with lesser responsibilities up-stream to Byron's Pool.</p>	4	1 [3 year appointment, from 01/01/20 to 31/12/22]	<p><del>Councillor A Bradnam (LD)</del></p> <p>[Sub – tbc]</p>	<p>Tom Larnach River Manager Conservators of the River Cam Clayhithe Office, Waterbeach Cambridge, CB25 9JB</p> <p>01223 863785</p> <p><a href="mailto:river.manager@camconservators.org.uk">river.manager@camconservators.org.uk</a></p>	Other Public Body representative
<p><b>Great Fen Steering Committee</b></p> <p>Steering Group to oversee and guide the development of the Great Fen Project.</p>	6	1 Observer Status	<p><del>Councillor A Costello (Con)</del></p> <p>tbc</p>	<p>Kate Carver Great Fen Project Manager</p> <p>01954 713513</p> <p><a href="mailto:Kate.Carver@wildlifebcn.org">Kate.Carver@wildlifebcn.org</a></p>	Other Public Body representative
<p><b>Greater Cambridge Local Plan Inception and Joint Local Planning Advisory Group</b></p> <p>To facilitate a shared policy position on the development of the new Greater Cambridge Local Plan.</p>	TBC	1	<p><del>Councillor N Shailer (Lab)</del></p> <p>Substitute</p> <p><del>Councillor L Harford (Con)</del></p> <p>tbc</p>	<p>Claire Tunnicliffe Committee Manager</p> <p>01223 457135</p> <p><a href="mailto:Claire.Tunnicliffe@cambridge.gov.uk">Claire.Tunnicliffe@cambridge.gov.uk</a></p>	Other Public Body representative

<p><b>Greensand Country Landscape Partnership</b></p> <p>The Greensand Country Landscape Partnership has been formed by a range of partners in the area to work with landowners and local communities and help make Greensand Country a living and working landscape that is cherished by present and future generations.</p>	TBC	1	<p><b>Councillor S Kindersley (LD)</b></p>	<p>The Old School Southill Road Cardington BEDFORD MK44 3SX</p> <p>01234 838774</p> <p><a href="mailto:team@greensandcountry.com">team@greensandcountry.com</a></p>	Other Public Body representative
<p><b>Growing Fenland – Project Delivery</b></p> <p>Chatteris Stakeholder Group March Stakeholder Group Whittlesey Stakeholder Group Wisbech Stakeholder Group</p> <p>A Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Funded Master Planning Group.</p>	TBC	1	<p><b>Councillor A Hay (Con)</b></p> <p><b>Councillor J French (Con)</b></p> <p><b>Councillor C Boden (Con)</b></p> <p><b>Councillor S Tierney (Con)</b></p> <p><b>Sub: Councillor S King (Con)</b></p> <p><b>tbc</b></p>	<p>Fenland District Council Fenland Hall County Road MARCH PE15 8NQ</p>	Other Public Body representative
<p><b>London Stansted Corridor Consortium Board</b></p> <p>A group of authorities and organisations in a corridor from London to Cambridge and Peterborough who are lobbying for improved infrastructure and connectivity.</p>	4	1	<p><b>Councillor A Bulat (Lab)</b></p>	<p>J McGill Director, London Stansted Cambridge Consortium</p> <p>020 84895282</p> <p><a href="mailto:John.McGill@haringey.gov.uk">John.McGill@haringey.gov.uk</a></p>	Other Public Body representative

<p><b>Natural Cambridgeshire</b></p> <p>Natural Cambridgeshire consists of a broad range of local organisations, businesses and people whose aim is to bring about improvements in their local natural environment.</p>	4	1	<p><b>Councillor H Cox Condron (Lab)</b></p>	<p>Phil Clark Community Green Spaces Manager 01223 715686 <a href="mailto:philip.clark@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">philip.clark@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a></p>	Other Public Body representative
<p><b>RECAP Board</b></p> <p>RECAP (Recycling in Cambridgeshire &amp; Peterborough) is a partnership of authorities across Cambridgeshire &amp; Peterborough working together to provide excellent waste and recycling services to meet local needs. The RECAP Board is the Member level group of this partnership.</p>	4	1	<p><b>Councillor R Hathorn (LD)</b></p> <p><b>Substitute - tbc</b></p>	<p>Neil Slopes <a href="mailto:neil.slopes@huntingdonshire.gov.uk">neil.slopes@huntingdonshire.gov.uk</a></p> <p>Bryony Rothwell <a href="mailto:Bryony.rothwell@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">Bryony.rothwell@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a></p>	Other Public Body representative
<p><b>St Neots Master Plan Steering Group</b></p>		1	<p><b>Councillor S Ferguson (Ind)</b></p> <p><b>Councillor S Taylor (Ind) – substitute</b></p>	<p>Domenico Cirillo <a href="mailto:domenico.cirillo@cambridgeshire.peterborough-ca.gov.uk">domenico.cirillo@cambridgeshire.peterborough-ca.gov.uk</a></p>	Other Public Body representative

<p>Anglian (Great Ouse) Regional Flood Coastal Committee</p> <p>The Regional Flood and Coastal Committee is a body through which the Environment Agency carries out its work on flood risk management and is responsible for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>maintaining or improving any watercourses which are designated as main rivers;</li> <li>maintaining or improving any tidal defences;</li> <li>installing and operating flood warning systems;</li> <li>controlling actions by riparian owners and occupiers which might interfere with the free flow of watercourses;</li> <li>supervising Internal Drainage Boards.</li> </ul>	2	3	<p>Councillor L Dupré (LD)</p> <p>Councillor G Wilson (LD)</p> <p>Councillor S Ferguson (Ind)</p> <p><b>Substitutes:</b></p> <p><b>Councillor D Ambrose Smith (Con)</b></p> <p><b>Councillor L Harford (Con)</b></p> <p><b>Councillor M Goldsack (Con)</b></p> <p><b>Tbc</b></p>	<p>Nigel Wood,  <a href="mailto:Nigel.Wood1@environment-agency.gov.uk">Nigel.Wood1@environment-agency.gov.uk</a></p>	Other Public Body representative
<p>Future Parks Accelerator Member Reference Group</p>	<p>4 – 6  (N.B. Project ends March 22)</p>	1	<p>Councillor S Ferguson (Ind)</p>	<p>Rob Pearce / Quinton Carroll  <a href="mailto:Robert.pearce@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">Robert.pearce@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>  <a href="mailto:Quinton.carroll@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">Quinton.carroll@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a></p>	Other public body representative

Planning Liaison Groups for local members listed below for information purposes:

Name of Body	Meetings per Annum	No of representatives	Representative(s)	Contact Details	Guidance Classification
<p>Barrington Quarry Site Liaison Committee</p> <p>The Committee will provide a forum for local representatives to discuss with staff from the operator of the former Barrington Quarry and Barrington Light Railway site matters and any direct impact of site and railway operations beyond its boundary. Members will be informed of site progress and rail operations and any other matters of relevance affecting the site or railway. It will provide a means whereby, in addition to day-to-day provisions made available by the operator, information and concerns or complaints about site or rail operations can be aired and appropriate</p>	2	1	<p>Local Member(s): Gamlingay S Kindersley (LD)</p>	<p>Ian Southcott UK Community Affairs Manager Cemex</p> <p>01788 517323</p> <p><a href="mailto:ian.southcott@cemex.com">ian.southcott@cemex.com</a></p>	Other Public Body representative

resolutions discussed.					
<p>Cambridgeshire Consultative Group for the Fletton Brickworks Industry (Whittlesey)</p> <p>The aim of this group is to develop and maintain lines of communication between the site operator, the County Council &amp; other regulatory bodies and the local community in order that matters of concern can be resolved in a timely and non-confrontational manner.</p>	2	1	<p>Local Member(s): Whittlesey North; Whittlesey South</p> <p>1 Member tbc</p>	<p>Diane Munday Secretary, Forterra</p> <p>01733 359148</p> <p><a href="mailto:Diane.munday@forterra.co.uk">Diane.munday@forterra.co.uk</a></p>	Other Public Body representative
<p>Needingworth Quarry Liaison Group</p> <p>The aim of this group is to develop and maintain lines of communication between the site operator, the County Council &amp; other regulatory bodies and the local community in order</p>	2	4	<p>Local Member(s): Cottenham &amp; Willingham; Somersham &amp; Earith; Longstanton, Northstowe &amp; Over; St Ives South &amp; Needingworth</p>	<p>Hilton Law Unit Manager – Cambridgeshire Hanson Aggregates</p> <p><a href="mailto:hilton.law@hanson.com">hilton.law@hanson.com</a></p> <p>Direct dial – 01487 849026 07773 313194</p>	Other Public Body representative

<p>that matters of concern can be resolved in a timely and non-confrontational manner.</p>			<p>N Gough (LD); F Thompson (LD); + 2 tbc</p>		
<p>Warboys Landfill Site Local Liaison Forum</p> <p>The aim of this group is to monitor progress of the development and the subsequent restoration of the land and provide a means to consider matters of local concern relating to the site.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Local Member(s): Warboys &amp; the Stukeleys tbc</p>	<p>Mark Farren Managing Director, Woodford Waste Management Services Ltd</p> <p>01487 824240</p> <p><a href="mailto:Mark.Farren@woodfordrecycling.co.uk">Mark.Farren@woodfordrecycling.co.uk</a></p>	<p>Other Public Body representative</p>
<p>Warboys Site Liaison Committee</p> <p>[Heat and power plant comprising biomass energy from waste facility and treatment of waste water by evaporation]</p> <p>The Committee will provide a forum for local representatives to discuss site matters and be informed of site progress. It will provide a means whereby information and concerns/complaints about the site can be aired with</p>	<p>4 then 1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Local Member(s): Warboys &amp; the Stukeleys tbc</p>	<p>Mark Farren Managing Director, Woodford Waste Management Services Ltd</p> <p>01487 824240</p> <p><a href="mailto:Mark.Farren@woodfordrecycling.co.uk">Mark.Farren@woodfordrecycling.co.uk</a></p>	<p>Other Public Body representative</p>

appropriate solutions discussed.					
<p>Milton Landfill Liaison Group (FCC)</p> <p>The aim of this group is to develop and maintain lines of communication between the site operator, the County Council &amp; other regulatory bodies and the local community in order that matters of concern can be resolved in a timely and non-confrontational manner.</p>	1-2	1	<p>Local Member(s):</p> <p><b>Cllr A Bradnam</b></p>	<p>Roisin Bennett</p> <p>Site Business Manager; Milton Landfill Site, East Anglian Closed Sites</p> <p>Mobile: 07827 231024</p> <p><a href="mailto:Roisin.Bennett@fccenvironment.co.uk">Roisin.Bennett@fccenvironment.co.uk</a></p>	Other Public Body representative
<p>Dimmocks Cote Liaison Group</p> <p>The aim of this group is to develop and maintain lines of communication between the site operator, the County Council &amp; other regulatory bodies and the local community in order that matters of concern can be resolved in a timely and non-</p>	1-2	1	<p>Local Member(s):</p> <p>Soham South &amp; Haddenham</p> <p><b>Cllr D Schumann</b></p>	<p>Kevin Hicks <a href="mailto:kevin.hicks@lkab.com">kevin.hicks@lkab.com</a></p> <p>Quarry Operations Manager</p> <p>01353 720726</p>	Other Public Body representative

confrontational manner.					
<p>Waterbeach Waste Management Park Liaison Group</p> <p>The aim of this group is to develop and maintain lines of communication between the site operator, the County Council &amp; other regulatory bodies and the local community in order that matters of concern can be resolved in a timely and non-confrontational manner.</p>	2	1	<p>Local Member(s)</p> <p>Cllr A Bradnam (LD)</p>	<p>Amey Liaison Group</p> <p>WasteEnquiries  <a href="mailto:AmeyCespa.Enquiries@amey.co.uk">AmeyCespa.Enquiries@amey.co.uk</a></p>	Other Public Body representative
<p>Mitchell Hill Liaison Group</p> <p>The aim of this group is to develop and maintain lines of communication between the site operator, the County Council &amp; other regulatory bodies and the local community in order that matters of concern can be resolved in a timely and non-</p>	2	2	<p>Local Member(s)</p> <p>Cllr N Gough &amp; Cllr A Bradnam</p>	<p>Mick George Limited (formerly Frimstone)</p> <p>Mr John Gough</p> <p>MG Planning  <a href="mailto:planning@mickgeorge.co.uk">planning@mickgeorge.co.uk</a></p>	Other Public Body representative

confrontational manner.					
<p>Envar Liaison Committee</p> <p>The aim of this group is to develop and maintain lines of communication between the site operator, the County Council &amp; other regulatory bodies and the local community in order that matters of concern can be resolved in a timely and non-confrontational manner.</p>	2	1	<p>Local Member(s): Somersham &amp; Earith tbc</p>	<p>Donna Haysom Office Manager, Envar Composting Ltd, (Cambridge) <a href="mailto:donna.haysom@envar.co.uk">donna.haysom@envar.co.uk</a> 01487 849840</p>	Other Public Body representative
<p>Little Paxton Quarry Liaison Group</p> <p>The aim of this group is to monitor progress of the development and provide a local forum to consider matters of local concern relating to the winning and working of minerals and restoration and afteruse.</p>	2	2	<p>Local Member(s): St Neots Priory Park &amp; Little Paxton; Brampton &amp; Buckden tbc</p>	<p>Aggregate Industries Kirsten Hannaford-Hill <a href="mailto:Kirsten.Hannaford-Hill@aggregate.com">Kirsten.Hannaford-Hill@aggregate.com</a></p>	Other Public Body representative

Appendix 2: Appointments to Advisory Groups and panels

Name of Body	Meetings per Annum	No. of representatives	Current representative(s)	Contact Details
<p><b>Green Investments Advisory Group</b></p> <p>To build a deeper understanding of green project business cases and new finance mechanisms; To provide a steer on detailed negotiations on new green commercial contracts where risk/rewards need to be balanced; and To inform better decision making at Council meetings for complex green investment projects.</p>	6	Currently 5, increasing to 7	<p>Councillor L Dupre (LD)  Councillor I Gardener (Con)  Councillor J Gowing (Con)  Councillor J Scutt (L)  Councillor T Wotherspoon (Con)</p> <p>Cllrs P Coutts, L Dupré, C Rae, S Ferguson, M Goldsack, J Gowing + J King</p> <p>Increasing to 7 Members: 3 Conservatives, 2 Liberal Democrats, 1 Labour, 1 Ind.</p>	<p>Sheryl French  Project Director  Energy Investment Unit</p> <p><a href="mailto:sheryl.french@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">sheryl.french@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a></p> <p>01223 728552</p>
<p><b>Local Access Forum</b></p> <p>Cambridgeshire County Council has established a Local Access Forum as required under the Countryside Rights Of Way Act (CROW) 2000. The Forum represents the interests of everyone who lives and works in the countryside and is trying to strike a balance between conserving it working it and helping people to enjoy it.</p>	4	2	<p>Councillor S King (Con)  Councillor M Smith (Con)  Cllr B Milnes (LD)  Cllr H Cox Condon (Lab)</p>	<p>Philip Clark  Community Greenspaces Manager</p> <p><a href="mailto:philip.clark@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">philip.clark@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a></p> <p>01223 715686</p>