

**ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES**

- Date:** Thursday, 7<sup>th</sup> February 2019
- Time:** 10.00 a.m. to 11.40 a.m.
- Present:** Councillors: D Ambrose-Smith, I Bates (Chairman), D Connor, R Fuller D Giles, D Jenkins (Substitute for Councillor Williams), N Kavanagh, S Tierney and T Wotherspoon (Vice- Chairman)
- Apologies:** Councillors H Batchelor and J Williams

**206. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None

**207. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> January 2019 were agreed as a correct record.

**208. MINUTE ACTION LOG**

The following oral update was provided (which had also been sent in an e-mail to the Committee on 5<sup>th</sup> February) in respect of the query on Minute 199 - 'Integrated Transport Block Funding Allocation Proposals' b) Air Quality Monitoring Budget – regarding if the Greater Cambridge Partnership contributed to the air quality monitoring budget and if not, whether they could be approached.

*“Following investigation I can clarify that Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) does not contribute directly to the air quality monitoring budget, or the mitigation measures that this budget supports. However, GCP has a broad range of air quality measures that it is supporting and financing. Some are in developing plans and policies, for example, the Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) with the City Council and a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the city that will align with clean air developments in the future. There are a number of feasibility projects being funded, such as the potential of an air quality zone within the city, and a study of low emission buses working with Stagecoach. GCP is also providing funding and project support for the Taxi electric charging project. On the soft measures, GCP funds travel planning work on changing people’s travel habits and encouraging a modal change to sustainable transport, which will have a positive impact on air quality”.*

The Minutes Action Log was noted.

**209. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS / REQUESTS TO SPEAK**

None received at the relevant deadlines.

## 210. RLW WATERBEACH NEW TOWN EAST PLANNING APPLICATION

The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan has allocated three new strategic scale residential led development sites at Waterbeach (8,000 to 9,000 dwellings), Bourn Airfield (3,500) and Cambourne West (1,200). The purpose of this report was to:

- update the Committee on the progress of the planning application for 4,500 dwellings at Waterbeach New Town East from RLW (a consortium comprising Turnstone Estates and Royal London Insurance),
- to appraise the Committee of the Council's response to the application, particularly in relation to the holding objections, and
- to approve the draft heads of terms that would be used in the planning agreement.

Prior to and since the submission of the planning application the County Council, the applicant and South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) had been involved in ongoing discussions to resolve outstanding issues relating to the application and to the planning obligations (section 106 agreement) to make the development acceptable. Officers had reviewed the RLW submission and supporting documents and a summary of the key issues was included in the report, with full detailed comments included in Appendix 2. It was highlighted that there were holding objections in respect of Transport, Education and Residual Flooding.

Attention was drawn to the detail on the key issues as being:

### Transport

No substantive element of the site could come forward without the relocated railway station and associated connection to the A10 being in place first. It could then be brought forward on a 'monitor and manage' basis, with an initial 800 units. The mitigation allowing this phase was dependent upon the railway station and was complementary to the proposed Urban and Civic mitigation package for junction improvements on the A10 corridor, a cycle way along the Mere Way between Waterbeach and Cambridge, and an enhanced bus service to central Cambridge.

Notwithstanding the mitigation detail provided, technical matters were required to be resolved before CCC was in a position to approve the evidence and to agree the initial mitigation package as detailed in paragraph 2.17 of the report under the following headings:

- Railway Station Delivery Model – Clarification of the railway station delivery along with a park and ride facility that would cater for the full demand of the existing station as well as an increased draw from the A10.
- Full development of 11,000 dwellings – The application proposals exceeded the assumed 2031 growth accounted for in the Ely to Cambridge Study. The applicant was required to clarify whether the strategic transport solution was able to cater for the additional growth beyond that envisaged by the Ely to Cambridge Transport Study.

- Access from the A10 – Information relating to the access and route through Urban and Civic was required.
- Rail Based Park and Ride - The applicant was required to commit to park and ride provision to accord with demand in the first phase, and to detail the access strategy for this parking.
- Public Transport Access Strategy - The applicant was required to investigate the potential for a combined first phase public transport strategy to compliment that of Urban and Civics.
- Mayor's Cambridge Autonomous Metro - The applicant was asked to detail that the masterplan of the eastern side of the town was capable of enabling a CAM route linking to the railway station in the future.

In principle Phase 1 for RLW with an associated mitigation package complementing that of Urban and Civics was considered possible. An indicative early phase mitigation package was detailed in the table in paragraph 2.18. Further development of the new town was dependent on the listed infrastructure being implemented. The developer would also be required to contribute, (with an overall cap to be agreed), towards the strategic solutions identified by the CPCA and Greater Cambridge Partnership to unlock future phases. This included contributions towards strategic infrastructure as detailed in the table under paragraph 2.21 of the report.

### Education

- The application had made provision for 2 primary school sites. The Council required assurance that appropriate allowance was made in the masterplan to accommodate the primary school sites up to 8 hectares (2 x 4ha) should the child yield from the development prove to be higher, as well as capital contributions towards their construction.
- The application made provision for an 8 Forms of entry secondary school with potential for further expansion. As with the primary schools, the applicant was required to demonstrate that the secondary school site was sufficient to accommodate the expanded school.
- Other provision included a site for a Post 16 facility if there was a demonstration of need with contributions to be sought from both developers towards this and an alternative facility off-site. The adjacent development would provide a site for special educational needs provision, that like the Post 16 provision, would be subject to a further County review, and for both developers making proportionate financial contributions towards this or alternative off-site provision.
- In terms of location, the secondary school was currently proposed to be located at the margins of the development. The Council preference was for a centrally located site within the community. The playing fields currently had a drainage ditch across them which was not acceptable and therefore Education would be objecting to the current masterplan showing the ditch in its current form.
- Details were provided of the Environmental Statement on outdoor noise levels at the southern primary school. Education officers required flexibility in terms of the layout of the building and positioning of non-teaching spaces as a noise barrier was a significant constraint in education terms and was not supported. Education officers were seeking additional information in respect of the noise impact to

schools and a holding objection had been raised until the highlighted matters were resolved.

### Floods Risk

- The Environmental Impact Assessment has revealed that a large part of the site, including the location of a primary school, was located in an area at residual risk of flooding from a potential breach of the river Cam defences. Consequently the applicant had proposed a number of mitigations, including the formation of a bund for the northern section of the site around residential areas and the primary school and ground raising in the southern part of the site. The Environment Agency and the Council's Flood Risk Team had raised a number of concerns relating to the applicant's approach to assessing and mitigating flood risk as detailed in the report. As a result, the County Council had raised a holding objection until the residual flood risk has been assessed in line with the *National Planning Policy Framework* (NPPF) and mitigated to the satisfaction of the local planning and flood risk authorities.

The other areas commented on were under the following headings:

Minerals and Waste - Waste management - in the event of planning permission being granted, an appropriate condition requiring a waste management and minimisation plan should be attached to the permission.

Libraries and Lifelong Learning - Based on 4,500 dwellings and an estimated population of 11,250 new residents would require provision of a new library facility to serve the development. Contributions would be sought from both developers towards the cost of providing the facility.

Public Health - The application, specifically the Health Impact Assessment, has been reviewed against the New Housing Developments and the Built Environment Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) for Cambridgeshire. This review ensures that the application and assessments have identified the relevant impacts on health and contains specific mitigation measures to address these impacts. The detailed review and recommendations were contained in Appendix 2 (section 6).

Connecting Cambridgeshire - the inclusion of a condition has been requested to be included in the planning permission to secure the need for Fibre/Fibre ducting to be developed during the construction of the development.

### **Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms**

The table set out in paragraph 2.43 provided a schedule of the planning obligations, key issues necessary to mitigate the impact of the development which the Committee was asked to endorse and to also agree a delegated authority to conclude the negotiation. The final heads of terms would be approved by the local planning authority prior to resolving to grant of planning permission.

Councillor Bradnam spoke as the local councillor raised issues regarding

- **Residual Flood Risk**, - asking whether the holding objection was still in place. In response the officer confirmed the Council and Environment Agency was still in negotiations about the issues identified. The area had been identified as Flood Risk 1 and was therefore considered a very low risk. However as there could be a breach in part of the river banks in very exceptional set of circumstances (although it was understood to be very unlikely) the two authorities were working together to understand the risks to the residential area and the primary school and discussing with the developer full mitigation measures for the school. A complication was some of the flood issues was outside the boundary and was very difficult for the developer to deal with. Paragraphs 5.1 to 5.5 of the officer comments set out in Appendix 2 of the report explained some of the proposals being looked at. The officer offered to send the clarifying document previously sent to Cllr Connor. **Action Juliet Richardson Business Manager Growth and Development**
- **Transport and phasing** – she expressed concerns whether it would work properly and whether one developer would take into account the requirements of the whole site. *e.g. it had been assessed that up to 1500 dwellings could be built without requiring any mitigation on the A10 with one applicant submitting their application on that assessment*) In response the officer highlighted that each phase of the development required the submission of a transport plan which, through the monitor and manage process would need to demonstrate mitigation of that phase.
- She highlighted that the first occupations would be geographically separated from the facilities of Waterbeach village and if there was any hold-up in the ongoing development, then these first adopters would be isolated for some time. *e.g. Trumpington Meadows had been developed with the initial two communities separated from each other and no community buildings provided.*
- **Foul water treatment** highlighting that the provision for waste water treatment in Waterbeach was already close to capacity and was concerned on how it was to be planned for the whole development. She highlighted that the current application referred to provision for waste water treatment being provided outside the red line boundary and asked how this would be managed? As a response it was explained that officers were aware of the issues and that mitigations in this area would be brought forward by the Minerals and Waste Team.

In subsequent discussions issues raised by Members included:

- With reference to the Railway Station mitigation asking how much involvement had there been from Network Rail? It was explained that RLW had led on the station with significant input from Network Rail. The process had currently reached the end of GRIP 3. Network Rail fully supported the proposals but had no money to contribute and therefore developers and other contributions were being sought.
- What were the plans for nursery provision? There was a recognised need for both statutory and private provision to be provided and space was being sought within the primary school site.
- With reference to the increasing awareness of the dangers to the health of children of traffic pollution, a Member again urged the need to ensure that the school

locations were away from main roads. In response, officers provided assurance that they took very seriously the advice provided from the specialist consultants in this area, to ensure the most appropriate site for schools was chosen.

- Whether in terms of improving the health and fitness of residents, consideration could be given to providing a swimming pool from Section 106 monies. Another Member echoed this, stating that he was surprised that the report stated that there were no significant public health implications and would have liked to have seen more measures to promote public health. Assurance was provided that there had been considerable public health input and officers were happy to provide further information outside of the meeting regarding information on what public health provision was being sought. On the issue of swimming pools, funding for any such proposal would need to come from schools budgets as Section 106 monies could only be used for mitigating the development. Officers were not precluding a swimming pool at this stage, but it would be for consideration at a later phase. Swimming pools could be built with capital monies but it was the on-going revenue / running costs of the facility that were very expensive. The Chairman suggested that the local member might wish to take up the issue of a swimming pool with the district council.
- That in the context of understanding the second planning application, the Committee would have benefitted from seeing details of the first application through the use of maps to help Members' understanding.
- That the report gave no sense of how people would move around the community and beyond, suggesting details of transport models used to inform the site would have been useful. In reply it was explained that in terms of phasing, each application required to come forward with a transport plan and for the current phase the transport mitigations were satisfied. The report provided a masterplan map.
- Asking what provision was being made in terms of land for allotments and burial grounds? It was explained that the current application was at a strategic level and the matters referred to would be for the local planning authority. This was something the Local Member could take up.

The Vice Chairman asked for and received approval from the Committee to make representations on behalf of the County Council to South Cambridgeshire District Council Planning Committee.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Approve the Council's comments on the planning application and draft section 106 heads of terms;
- 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 Council's response in Appendix 2 of the report ; and

- c) Delegate to the Executive Director (Place and Economy) in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee the authority to conclude negotiations on the section 106 agreement.

## **211. BOURN AIRFIELD OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

The Committee received a report to consider and endorse the officers' response already sent to South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) on the outline planning application for up to 3,500 new dwellings at Bourn Airfield.

As the site was allocated, there was already a presumption in favour of development and therefore from the Council's side there was a need to ensure that the proposals were acceptable in terms of mitigation of impacts. All matters were reserved, except for access issues, including the principal highway junctions from St Neots Road roundabout and the Broadway.

Pre-application discussions had been held with County Council officers, as well as public consultation events and workshops to establish the requirements for the proposed development. Appendix A of the report contained the full officer response submitted to SCDC. Where necessary, valid objections had been made which would constitute a material consideration when the local planning authority determined the planning application. The main County Council officer comments were summarised in paragraphs 2.3 – 2.14 of the report.

### Developer contributions / s106 agreement

Table 1 of the report detailed the key infrastructure items required and proposed for the development. The Committee was asked, to endorse them and agree a delegated authority as set out in the report recommendation to conclude the negotiation.

In terms of the application the key issues were highlighted as being:

### Education

The planning application proposed two new on-site primary schools (with early year's settings), a new on-site secondary school and an off-site contribution towards Special Educational Needs (SEN). In addition, plots would be available for private nursery use subject to market demand. This approach was supported in principle, subject to agreeing the detailed site and financial matters in the s106 agreement. The Education Service has identified that the applicant needed to update their child yield requirements to take account of revised agreed general multipliers, requiring some additional land and school building, as detailed in Appendix 1. paragraphs 1.8 to 1.12 of the officer response.

The planning application proposed that the schools should be built to Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREAAM) "Excellent". As this conflicted with the County Council policy of construction, a holding objection had been raised until the BREAAM requirements aligned with County Council policy.

## Archaeology

A holding objection had been raised until officers were satisfied that the impacts of the development on the heritage assets of archaeological importance were adequately addressed with regard to mitigation measures.

## Transport Assessment

A holding objection is raised until, (i) further information was provided and assessed and the Transport Assessment was approved, (ii) the mitigation measures and contribution amounts, including those for the Greater Cambridge Partnership schemes were fully agreed, and (iii) Public Rights of Way requirements are satisfied.

## Other services

Public Health, Lead Local Flood Authority, County Planning and Strategic Waste and Library Service had raised issues of concern which could either be addressed by way of planning condition or by working with the application to agree appropriate mitigation measures.

Councillor Steve Jones representing Bourn Parish Council and the Coalition of 23 parish Councils west of Cambridge spoke in support of the report, especially the officer comments on trip generation and traffic impacts. He highlighted the Parishes' concerns on traffic flow from both the expected traffic from the proposed development, as well as the continued estimated growth in vehicle journeys from Cambourne. He explained that they were not convinced that local transport infrastructure could cope with the projected increase.

He highlighted that an estimated 1900 cars could leave Bourn airfield during the school run. He made suggestions that reviews needed to be undertaken in a number of areas in addition to those proposed by the officers, including:

- capacity at the Cambourne roundabout,
- Broadway-Old St Neots way junctions
- Traffic surveying the B1046 Bourn-Toft-Comberton-Barton Road
- Traffic surveying the Old St Neots Road between the Dry Drayton and Madingley Mulch Roundabouts
- Traffic surveying the north-south roads through Caldecote, Hardwick and Comberton
- The Hardwick A428 dumbbell junction
- The junction of the Broadway Old A428

The Parishes view was that if Bourn Airfield was to go ahead, the design should include a direct link onto the A428 with its own dumb-bell roundabout to discourage commuters from Bourn Airfield from using local roads. Construction should only be approved once an all-ways interchange at Girton was approved. He also suggested the need to link Greater Cambourne, to the proposed Cam light rail/ tram network and/or

proposals that the East West rail link should be routed via Cambourne. (A more detailed version of this submission is provided at **Appendix 1 to the minutes**).

The local Member for Cambourne making reference to the officer comments on pages 80-81 on trip generation and traffic impacts fully supported them. He highlighted the need for the site to have its own dumbbell roundabout access to the A428 and supported a Park and Ride facility at Scotland Way. He suggested that the officer holding response required further strengthening to also take into account the issues raised by Councillor Jones.

In discussion Members of the Committee raised issues / asked questions including:

- Requesting an update on the he East-West proposed rail link. It was explained that there had been a number of route options with significant cost implications and that a report would be coming forward to the March Committee meeting.
- Asking about the possibility of a light railway link. In reply it was recognised that the site required a rapid transit route. Officers were currently looking at the possibility of direct contributions towards the GCP Cambourne to Cambridge scheme.
- With reference to page 83 and the comment on off-site pedestrian and cycle improvements that further details were required, the Council Cycling Champion asked when this information would be received, making the point that while he understood the importance of road traffic flows mitigation etc. pedestrian and cycleways always appeared to seen as an afterthought. In reply it was clarified that the pedestrian and cycle-links were an essential part of the Transport Strategy and that the site provided excellent opportunities for mass transit links. There was still a need to secure a package of cycle measures and therefore there was a holding objection regarding more information being provided regarding the Transport Assessment.
- Other issues raised that did not appear to be included was reference to broadband provision and electric charging points being provided.
- A question was raised regarding whether the Council intended to build its own nursery provision as the Member raising it had in the past received feedback from parents unhappy regarding the terms and conditions offered by some private nurseries. In reply it was clarified that the County Council does not provide separate build nursely places. Early Years provision would be included within primary schools and a range of provision was being looked for, including provision from the voluntary sector.
- Support was expressed that Bourn access to the Broadway should only be via a left turn into the site and a right turn out. Clarification was required on how this would be achieved. In further discussion it was confirmed that it would be possible to engineer this by providing a central island to physically restrict turning movements.
- Had there been any resistance from the district council and the developer regarding the proposal to increase the forms of entry from six to seven? No response had been received but the change was required following the revised multiplier agreed by the Council 18 months ago.

- How strong was the holding objection in terms of future proofing issues on transport etc? In reply, from the transport side, it was for the planning authority to consider the County Council's objections. They would not be removed until details were provided regarding the requested mitigations and contributions to a rapid transit solution.

The Vice Chairman asked for and received approval from the Committee to make representations on behalf of the County Council to South Cambridgeshire District Council Planning Committee.

Following the consideration of the Committee's comments and Parish Council Member contributions,

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) approve the Council's comments on the planning application and draft section 106 heads of terms;
- 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 Council's response set out in Appendix 1 of the report and
- c) Delegate to the Executive Director (Place and Economy) in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee the authority to conclude negotiations on the section 106 agreement.

## **212. EXTENDING THE FUNDING ON CONTRACTUAL BUS SERVICES TO THE END OF 2019-20 FINANCIAL YEAR**

With the creation of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA), the responsibility for passenger transport moved from Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) to the CPCA. For both 2017/18 and 2018/19, the Combined Authority delegated the delivery function back to the County Council. During 2018/19, this Committee agreed to fund replacement bus services for existing contracts with CCC including primary rural routes until the end of March 2019 on the expectation that the CPCA review would be concluded in November 2018. The contracts were now approaching their end, and a decision was required on whether or not to extend the funding further.

This report, which was not available at the time of the original agenda despatch but was listed as a "to follow item", was agreed as an urgent item by the Chairman of the Committee using his Chairman delegated powers under the Local Government Act 1972. The reason for urgency being that if a decision was not made early in February, the bus services referred to would be de-registered before the next available Committee date leading to a gap in provision for communities. The reason for lateness was that the Combined Authority Board had only agreed the way forward following receipt of the CPCA Bus Review reported to the CPCA Board on 30<sup>th</sup> January 2019. Following this, they had agreed to create a Bus Reform Group to liaise with the bus operators to look at the medium and longer term provision of bus services franchises. This would be ongoing work for the CPCA. In the short term the CPCA had again delegated the responsibility for bus services back to Cambridgeshire County Council for 2019/20.

The report proposed that in line with the delegation received, the County Council should continue to deliver bus services for one further year with the report seeking approval to the extension of funding for contracted bus services until the end of March 2020, subject to final contract prices being affordable. Paragraphs 2.3 to-2.5 set out the details of the funding, which were sufficient to fund all the existing funded services until the end of March 2020.

In view of the ongoing possibility of further contract changes or increased tender prices, it was also recommended that delegated authority should be granted to the Executive Director, Place and Economy, in consultation with Chairman / Vice Chairman to consider the award of any future contracts to cover for de-registrations in-year, provided they were within the retained budget or if not, to be funded by the CPCA.

In discussion questions raised included:

- Why was the CPCA not paying now it was their responsibility and why was it now a decision for E and E Committee? In reply it was explained that the delivery of the service for both Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) and Peterborough City Council (PCC) could be delegated back, along with the funding to administer them, which is what CPCA had again agreed
- The same Member highlighted that the report suggested that the County Council were having to find money to cover the additional costs of bus services taken on during the year and asked:
  - What was the amount of the levy and was it inclusive of all the amounts CCC were putting in and why was there not a paragraph in the report providing this detail? In response, The Chairman of the Committee explained that the total amount of the levy to CCC was around £8m.
  - Why was there no paragraph in the report to explain why the CA had asked CCC to fund it for another year? This related to the late reporting from the review which resulted in the CPCA not being in a position to make final decisions on bus routes. The report sought to be transparent on where the money required was budgeted for within the CCC budgets (*Note as detailed in paragraph 2.4*). The intention of the report was also to make clear to the public as soon as possible that the County Council would be continuing the bus services for another year. Officers agreed to provide a written response to the Committee with more detail on the levy arrangements, its cost to the Council, including an explanatory breakdown of the full costs of subsidising the exiting bus services covered and how the current decisions had come about. **Action: Executive Director / Public Transport Manager**

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Agree to extend the funding for subsidised contracted bus services until the end of the 2019/20 financial year, using reserves held for this purpose, and
- b) Delegate to the Executive Director, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee, authority to agree with the Cambridgeshire

and Peterborough Combined Authority the funding required to contract for any further bus services de-registered in 2019/20

## **213. CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH MINERALS AND WASTE LOCAL PLAN – FURTHER DRAFT PLAN**

Councillor Fuller left the room during discussion of this item. Colour copies of appendix 2 were tabled at the meeting and large scale maps pinned to the wall for reference purposes.

The report asked the Committee to consider and approve the further draft Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan for the purpose of public consultation to commence in March 2019 for a period of six weeks supported by a range of documents, including the Waste Needs Assessment; Mineral and Waste Spatial Strategy papers, providing more details about the proposed mineral allocations, including reserves, anticipated start dates and indicative extraction rate. Individual Ste Assessments would also be available at this time. As an oral update it was reported that Peterborough City Council had already approved the report without amendments.

It was highlighted that only 15% of waste was municipal (domestic) with construction and demolition activity accounting for the majority. Only 2% of waste was classed as hazardous.

The further Draft Plan included changes from suggestions made on the Preliminary Draft Plan from the first round of consultations undertaken during May and June 2018. The consultation had resulted in over 500 representations being received from approximately 180 individual respondents. An overview of the results was set out in paragraph 2.5 of the officer covering report. In addition to considering representations received, the opportunity had also been taken to update the Plan to take into account new evidence and updated national policy.

The revised Draft Plan included as Appendix 1 to the officer report proposed allocating the following new mineral sites to address the 'capacity gap' that had been identified with paragraph 3.2 of the report providing more commentary detail:

- Block Fen / Langwood Fen, Nr. Mepal
- Bare Fen / West Fen, Needingworth Quarry
- Mitchell Hill Farm South and Chear Fen, Cottenham
- Kings Delph Whittlesey
- Burwell Brickpits, Burwell

In terms of waste management allocations, Officers of both councils were recommending that the Plan did not allocate any new waste management sites with the reasons provided in paragraph 3.3 of the report. Instead, the Plan proposed a 'criteria based' approach to dealing with any waste management related proposals that did come forward. The criteria based policy would seek to direct waste management development primarily to urban areas, with a focus on land which had been identified for industrial uses; suitable brownfield land; and in certain circumstances edge of settlement locations. It was also suggested that strategic development areas incorporate waste management facilities of an appropriate scale to take some responsibility for dealing with their own waste; and that

in rural areas only those facilities which would be located on a farm holding, and which would facilitate agricultural waste recycling or recovery of waste generated on that farm, would be supported. Waste management proposals located on medical or research sites to deal with waste generated on those sites would, in principle, be supported; as would co-location of facilities with complementary activities. Waste disposal would only be permitted where there was demonstrable need and where the waste has been pre-sorted and could not practicably be recycled.

Issues raised in discussion included:

- Clarifying that building materials not removed from a development site that was reclaimed and re-used for example secondary aggregate, was not classed as waste e.g. the runways at Alconbury.
- Confirming that the Greenleaf award given to contractors re-using waste on the A10 did happen as a matter of course. It was in the interest of Developers to recycle waste, as otherwise they would incur additional transportation and landfill charge costs.

It was resolved to:

- a) Approve the attached Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan – Further Draft Plan and Policies Map for the purposes of public consultation commencing in March 2019.
- b) Delegate to the Executive Director, Place and Economy in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee, the authority to make any minor non-consequential amendments to the consultation documents attached to the officer's report prior to consultation.
- c) Delegate to the Executive Director, Place and Economy, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee, the authority to make more substantive changes to the documents prior to consultation, if it would address any substantive suggested amendments arising from the Report's consideration by Peterborough City Council's democratic process.

## 214. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – DECEMBER 2018

The Committee received this report in order to comment on the projected financial and Performance outturn position as at the end of December 2018.

The main issues highlighted were:

**Revenue:** The Service had started the financial year with two significant pressures for both the Coroners Services and Waste (both which came under Highways & Community Infrastructure Committee). The Place and Economy Service was now forecasting an overspend of £132K at year end, but it was anticipated that this would be off-set by additional income or reduced expenditure forecasts by year end and therefore the bottom line position would be on target.

**Performance:** Of the eight performance indicators, three were currently red, one was amber and four were green.

The indicators currently red were:

- Local bus passenger journeys originating in the authority area.
- The average journey time per mile during the morning peak on the most congested routes
- % of Freedom of Information requests answered within 20 days.

At year-end, the current forecast was that the local bus passenger journeys and the average journey time indicators would remain red, two would be amber and four green.

One Member raised a query on page 268 on the graph titled 'Average journey time during the morning peak period' regarding why the target time line had risen between 2016-2017. The officers agreed to look into this and write to the Committee outside of the meeting. **Action: Andy Preston**

It was unanimously resolved to note the report.

**215. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN, TRAINING PLAN AND APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES, PARTNERSHIP, LIAISON AND ADVISORY GROUPS**

This report invited the Committee to review its Agenda and Training Plans which had been included as appendices to the report. The Training Plan details had not changed since the last meeting with the only training still to take place being the 15<sup>th</sup> March Member Seminar on the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan. There were no updates to report in respect of the agenda plan and no appointments were required to be made.

The Agenda and Training Plans were noted.

**216. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING 10 A.M. THURSDAY 14<sup>th</sup> MARCH 2019**

**Chairman:  
14<sup>th</sup> March 2019**