

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY POLICY AND SERVICE COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Thursday 17th September 2020

Time: 10:00am – 12.55p.m.

Present: Councillors A Bradnam, L Dupré, I Gardener, J Gowing, P Hudson, J Schumann (Chairman), J Scutt, M Shuter, G Wilson and T Wotherspoon (Vice-Chairman)

26. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No apologies for absence were received.

The following Councillors declared non-statutory disclosable interests under the Code of Conduct:

- Councillor Bradnam, in relation to item 30, as a resident of Milton and Chair of the Parish Council Air Quality Working Party.
- Councillor Gardener, in relation to item 30, as Vice-Chairman of the Council's Planning Committee.
- Councillor Schumann, in relation to item 32, as the Council's representative on the Great Ouse Regional Flood Coastal Committee.
- Councillor Wilson, in relation to item 32, as he was in receipt of a pension from the Environment Agency.
- Councillor Wotherspoon, in relation to item 32, as the Council's representative on the Great Ouse Regional Flood Coastal Committee and as Chairman of the Cambridgeshire Flood Risk Management Partnership. He also declared an interest in relation to item 31 as the Council's representative on the Greater Cambridge Joint Local Planning Advisory Group.

27. MINUTES – 9TH JULY 2020

The minutes of the meeting held on 9th July 2020 were agreed as a correct record subject to the correction of three typographical errors submitted by Councillor Bradnam, and would be signed by the Chairman when the Council returned to its offices.

28. ACTION LOG

The action log was noted. One Member drew attention to an issue which had not been included in the action log. The Committee was reminded that it had been agreed to discuss at a future meeting the wider issue of whether the cost of a grid connection upgrade triggered by the County Council could be divided between subsequent connectors. The Chairman suggested that this issue should be considered at a future training session on energy projects and then, if necessary, a report should be presented to Committee. **Action Required.**

29. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No petitions or public questions had been received.

30. MILTON HOUSEHOLD RECYCLING CENTRE

The Committee considered a report detailing a proposal to maintain, expand and redevelop the Household Recycling Centre (HRC) at its current location on Butt Lane, Milton independent from the adjacent landfill site. Attention was drawn to the background to the proposal. It was noted that an assessment had identified Butt Lane as the most suitable location for an HRC. In order to expand the site to meet increased demand, three initial designs had been developed, which would involve the use of a split level site and improved segregation of site users and operations, improved customer parking and throughput to maximise site efficiency, increased opportunity for material recycling and reuse, and facilities to allow the acceptance of trade waste from small and medium sized enterprises. The Council was proposing that Option 3 be taken forward for public consultation in late October/early November and subsequently planning permission in the early part of 2021, as it provided the greatest capacity for at least the next 70 years and also the best value for money. Attention was drawn to the risks which might result in a delay to the project or the need to look for a different site.

Speaking as the Local Member, Councillor Bradnam reported that she had reservations about the Council's proposed Option C. She was concerned that the proposal to build an operational area for skip lorries 1.8m lower than the current ground level would just result in it filling up with water as the gault clay was impermeable with therefore no natural drainage. She was also concerned about the impact of the water run-off from Butt Lane. She commented that the plan did not show the footprint of the existing site against the new site. She was keen that any plan should maintain the existing mature tree belt on the northern part of the site as it screened the site from the road. She also asked that there should be no composting at this location, as she was concerned about the impact of odours on nearly 5,000 residents who lived down wind of the site. She therefore urged the Council to consult on all the options and not just Option 3.

The Commission Manager (Waste) reported that the Council had only carried out outline designs. Drainage design would be undertaken in detail at the next stage of the design iteration if Members supported the recommendations. He explained that a split level site would enable the Council to separate clean surface water from contaminated surface water from operational areas. If the Council secured planning permission, it would then apply for an Environmental Permit in order to be able to operate the site and the suitability of the drainage design would form part of determining this application. He acknowledged that he was not sure whether the current highway drainage between the site and Butt Lane was sufficient. He reported that the HRC would collect waste and recycling, all composting operations would continue to be carried out at Waterbeach. It is intended that the current mature tree belt screening of the site be retained to be sympathetic to the green belt location. The new site would therefore retain the screening.

In response, the Local Member reported that she had consulted both local Parish and District Councillors who had questioned whether it was possible to drain a site under laid by clay. The highway run off from Butt Lane currently created a considerable pool of water in front of the site. She was therefore concerned about the maneuverability of lorries down to a 1.8m lower operational area, which could

be muddy and slippery, and the impact of this on nearby roads. She therefore stressed the importance of the design being agreed following consultation with the public who should have access to elevation drawings for all three designs with a comparison of the footprint of the current site so the final option choice could be informed by local knowledge.

The Chairman expressed his concern about the Council not choosing an option for the consultation, particularly in relation to the finances and the impact on the green belt. He had been reassured by the Commission Manager (Waste) that the drainage would be investigated in detail in the detailed design stage. However, if the consultation responses were of such a nature that the issues raised by the Local Member were not easily resolved then the Council would need to look at other options.

The Commission Manager (Waste) reported that the other options would be included as part of the planning consultation to show how the Council had identified Option 3. He explained that the proposal to prepare elevation designs for all options would incur additional costs. The Chairman was of the view that the current plan drawings were sufficient as they could be indicative of height and provided enough reference to inform the early stages of the consultation. The Local Member expressed her disappointment, as she felt that the elevation designs were needed to make the consultation meaningful.

Another Member drew attention to the fact that the recommendations took the Council all the way to the submission of a planning application under delegated powers. It was therefore very important that the Council selected the right option at the beginning. It was not clear in the report what would happen if significant problems were identified with Option 3. The consultation therefore needed to consider alternative options with elevation drawings. It was also important that if any problems were identified with Option 3 it should come back to the Committee for further consideration. The Chairman reported that the delegation had been included to expedite the planning application if no problems were identified. He confirmed that a report would be brought back to committee if significant issues were identified. The Executive Director: Place and Economy welcomed the issues raised and he confirmed that an application would not be taken forward if it was unlikely to be approved.

The Chairman proposed an amendment, with the agreement of the Committee, to recommendation (i), to add “as a preferred option” after Option 3 and “and include other options” at the end of the recommendation.

It was resolved to:

- (i) support the recommendation in 2.5 of the report to take forward design Option 3, as a preferred option for public consultation and planning submission, and include other options.
- (ii) delegate responsibility to the Executive Director – Place and Economy in consultation with the chair of Environment and Sustainability Committee to:
 - a) work with the landfill operator to minimise the impact of retaining and expanding the Household Recycling Centre at Butt Lane Milton on the landfill site operations;

- b) prepare an application to decouple the Household Recycling Centre from the landfill and make the Household Recycling Centre permanent in its current location;
- c) carry out a pre-application consultation with the local community on the preferred site design;
- d) submit a planning application to retain, expand and upgrade the Household Recycling Centre, and
- e) submit a section 73 planning application to make the necessary amendments to the restoration profiles for the landfill site to allow the Household Recycling Centre to remain in its current location.

31. NORTH EAST CAMBRIDGE DRAFT AREA ACTION PLAN CONSULTATION

The Committee considered a report detailing the Council's consultation response to the North East Cambridge Draft Area Action Plan (AAP) being developed by Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils. Attention was drawn to the proposed vision for the draft AAP. The area included Cambridge Regional College, as well as the Science Park, Cowley Road, Nuffield Road and the garages off Milton Road. It was noted that the draft AAP sought to deliver a new high quality mixed-use city district, providing 8,000 new homes and 20,000 new jobs.

Members attention was drawn the background to the draft AAP. It was noted that transport was a key consideration and County Council officers had been involved with City and District colleagues in providing evidence, which had resulted in the proposal to establish a trip budget, as well as measures to promote non car modes. It was also proposed to utilise existing high quality public transport links. The draft AAP included three primary schools sites, and a secondary school site had been safeguarded should there be sufficient need. The importance of the Fen Road level crossing was highlighted, although it was not in the AAP area, but there was no provision in the draft AAP for an alternative vehicle crossing.

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

Fen Road Level Crossing

- highlighted the importance of finding an alternative given that the barrier for the crossing was down for around 30 minutes out of each hour. It was noted that the Combined Authority had got its own safeguarding in the draft AAP in relation to its CAM Metro connection. It was also a partner in trying to get an alternative to the Fen Road crossing. However, it was not easy given that ownership of the problem was split across a range of organisations. There was a sense of urgency if the Greater Cambridge Planning Service was going to introduce a policy of safeguarding for alternative crossing in the draft AAP, as the work had to have reached a sufficiently advanced stage. Unfortunately, the work was proceeding slowly. The Highway Authority did not want to do all the work at its own expense when it could be better co-ordinated amongst partners.

Trip Budget

- queried how the trip budget would work, for example what would happen if it was used up or what corrective measures were in place if it was exceeded. The Principal Transport Officer reported that traffic monitoring would be used to monitor the trip budget. As developments came forward in stages, the Council

would be able to monitor travel patterns and behaviours for specific trip budgets within the overall trip budget. The area had significant investment in infrastructure such as the Chisholm Trail, the Greenway Network, the Greenway following the Guided Busway and eventually CAM Metro. It was noted that all this infrastructure would allow for modal shift as development came forward thereby maintaining the trip budget.

- questioned if a developer used up the trip budget in earlier stages whether there would be a reduction in the number of properties so subsequent stages could be diminished. There was concern about the impact of this on affordable housing.

Public Open Spaces

- the need to strengthen the Council's response in relation to planning for the right mix of public open spaces in the light of Covid-19. Attention was drawn to the fact that a number of properties would be built without private open space so public open space was very important. The Chairman reminded the Committee that this area was very close to Milton Country Park. The Project Manager reported that draft AAP was being informed by principles within the NHS Healthy Towns document. These principles would therefore influence the provision of public open spaces. Planning Officers were aware of the impact of Covid-19 on planning and it was likely that there would be more to add to the draft AAP in future. Speaking as the Local Member for Milton, Councillor Bradnam reported that the green infrastructure at Milton Country Park had already been eroded due to pressure of use.

Parking

- queried whether there was a need for Civil Parking Enforcement outside of Cambridge particularly as it was acknowledged that the development would lead to overspill parking in surrounding communities. It was also queried what extent the responsibility to mitigate these problems would lie with the developer. The Principal Transport Officer reported that Civil Enforcement was a matter for South Cambridgeshire District Council to decide upon. A developer could be asked to fund double yellow lines in Milton but enforcement would remain a police responsibility. The same Member highlighted the fact that parking enforcement was not a police priority. Speaking as the Local Member for Milton, Councillor Bradnam reported that there was already displacement parking in Milton.

Transport

- requested a copy of the position statement developed by County Council transport officers to outline how the Council intended to deal with planning applications. **Action Required.**

Mixed Development

- queried whether there was any experience as to how mixed developments had worked in practice and whether there was a mechanism to control such developments. There was concern residents would not necessarily work in the area and that the developer could reduce the commercial industrial areas first if the trip budget was exceeded. The Project Manager reported that there was not a mechanism in relation to living and working in the area. The proposals would attract those working at the Science Park and nearby in Cambridge, and be influenced to adopt low car ownership. The Member added that developers

should not meet the trip budget by restricting the mix of development. The Project Manager agreed to clarify that in the response.

BREEAM excellent

- queried whether BREEAM excellent would also apply to residential buildings. It was noted that BREEAM excellent was being pursued for all buildings. The Council had raised it in its response in relation to schools. It was noted that sometimes BREEAM scored schools low which was an unfair reflection. It was therefore welcomed that officers would be open to other guidance and mechanisms in relation to sustainability. It was noted that Climate Change was a strong theme in the draft AAP. The Chairman added that the Government was developing the future homes standard which would inform this development.

Biodiversity

- queried how it was proposed to monitor biodiversity in order to get to 10%. The Chairman reported that there was a natural capital methodology which could be used for calculating environmental net gain.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Consider and approve the County Council's consultation response to the North East Cambridge Draft Area Action Plan; and
- b) Delegate to the Executive Director: Place & Economy, the authority to make any minor changes to the consultation response prior to submission in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Environment and Sustainability Committee.

32. THE GREAT OUSE FENS TACTICAL PLAN - CHANGES TO FLOOD RISK FUNDING

The Committee considered a report detailing the overall concept, approach and framework of the Fens Tactical Plans. Attention was drawn to the background, which included changes to the flood funding approach in the Fens. Members were informed of the long term 'Flood Risk Management for the Fens' project for the next 50 to 100 years. In the meantime, there was a need to understand the maintenance and capital work needed to continue to manage flood risk, which had led to the establishment of a Tactical Plan. The aim of the Tactical Plan was to demonstrate the short term programme of works required over the next 10 to 15 years, the costs, the benefits that would be achieved, and how government funding should be allocated to the projects to limit the risk of abortive projects and ensure best value. Attention was drawn to the benefit apportionment and funding eligibility to ensure the Government only paid once for a certain benefit. It was noted that the Committee would receive further reports on the long-term project as it progressed.

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

- welcomed the strategic approach set out in the report. However, there was concern about the 10 to 15 years to be taken to produce the long-term plan. The Flood Risk & Biodiversity Business Manager reported that the long-term strategy would come back to Committee. Members were informed that the Tactical Plan was currently at Phase 1 focusing on the baseline and the likely costs. It was noted that a report on Phase 1 would be presented to Members by the end of the year. Members were informed that there was currently no comprehensive flood model for the whole of the Fens. Modelling was expensive, intensive and took time. The next stage, Phase 1b, involved engaging stakeholders such as agriculture, tourism, and residents to understand through Phase 2 people's vision for the Fens. Phase 3 would then consider how that Strategy could be delivered and funded. It was important to note that it was a long-term project commensurate with the Thames Barrier.
- queried the lack of account taken by the Tactical Plans of the impact of climate change. Members were informed that the modelling needed to be in place first before the impact of climate change could be quantified and this would happen as part of the long term strategy. It was noted that current government funding has not previously included allowing for climate change impact, but this was now changing. Members were informed that technical partners had discussed the significant climate change impacts and predictions indicated that significant impacts would not be felt in the next 10 to 15 years, hence the project being started now, rather than waiting until a later date. It was noted that Internal Drainage Board (IDB) watercourses were often well designed to cope with more than the design standard.
- highlighted the cost to be met by partners of £80.4M and queried how much the County Council would have to pay compared to what it was already paying. Members were informed that, the County Council did not make a significant contribution towards (IDB) defences, and that for the current 10 to 15 years of the Tactical Plan this was unlikely to change. It was likely that there would be funding changes in the future for all partners with the long-term strategy but this was not clear at this stage.
- expressed surprise that climate change was not specifically accounted for in the Tactical Plan. One Member raised the need to include a specific sign off for climate change in the report template for Policy and Service Committees. It was important that the Council treated climate change very seriously as it was evident that there were immediate impacts. The Chairman agreed to investigate the request with the Executive Director: Place and Economy.
Action Required.
- queried the level of risk associated with the length of the Tactical Plans particularly as there would be no improvements to flood defences during the next 10 to 15 years. It was acknowledged that there was sufficient flexibility in the IDB systems to cope with some degree of change from climate change, and that many of the issues were not within the control of the County Council. However, there was particular concern about the delay to possible improvements and how the risk would be measured. The Flood Risk & Biodiversity Business Manager reported that all partners were frustrated about the lack of climate change projections as it was important to all of them, but the

accurate modelling was not yet available to inform those projections. She informed Members that partners would be considering this information as soon as possible, as a priority rather than waiting 10 to 15 years. She also explained that if a big asset needed replacing then flood management partners would have joint discussions with government and stakeholders to ensure the best decision was made for an asset at a specific point. However, it was unlikely that any of the major assets would need replacing in the next 10 to 15 years.

- acknowledged that climate change was covered by the freeboard built into IDB designs but highlighted the fact that every summer properties were damaged by water overtopping that freeboard. The Chairman commented that the reasons for some of the flooding might have been operational (i.e. rather than related to design). The Flood Risk & Biodiversity Business Manager reported that much of the recent flooding was not related to IDB systems. She drew attention to the designs used by IDBs in Fen areas which involved a significant amount of resilience, and in those areas there was often not major flooding.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Endorse the overall concept, approach and framework of the Fens Tactical Plans.

33. NORTHSTOWE PHASE 3A - OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION RESPONSE

The Chairman agreed to take items 33 and 34 together in terms of the officer introduction. The Business Manager Growth and Development explained the reasons for including them as separate items on the agenda.

Members received a report detailing the officers' response to an outline planning application for up to 4,000 new dwellings at Northstowe Phase 3a. Attention was drawn to the background covering the outline planning application (OPA) submitted by Homes England. The County Council had been engaged closely with South Cambridgeshire District Council and the Northstowe developers throughout the whole development of the new town. This had continued with Phases 3a and 3b with extensive pre-application engagement. Attention was drawn to Appendix 1 of the reports which set out the Council's detailed comments in relation to the OPA. Members also noted the key issues arising from the development in terms of the development impacts and the level of mitigation which would be required through planning obligations. It was noted that in the absence of a Transport Assessment and the need for Section 106 work to be concluded, it was not clear what some of the mitigation measures would be.

The Business Manager Growth and Development therefore proposed that the Council should send a holding objection to the District Council acknowledging that the Council was working well with the applicant but at the present time those discussions needed to continue. It was noted that the Council still needed to put together a set of Section 106 requests that would go before the local planning authority. It was suggested that they should be considered by the Committee for agreement.

Speaking as the Local Member, Councillor Hudson highlighted the constitutional requirement of keeping Local Members informed. He therefore expressed disappointment that he had not been contacted, and had therefore had no

consultation or input into the reports or the Council's response at any stage. He acknowledged that the issue of Local Member consultation had been raised at the Chair, Vice-Chair and Lead Members meeting. He explained that he only became aware of these reports when the agenda was published. Other Local Members bordering onto his Division were not invited to give comment or register to speak, until 14 September, giving them little time to comment or register. He was of the view that this was unacceptable as it went to the heart of this authority's democratic system, and therefore it was a failure as his residents could not be fully represented.

He explained that the response from this authority was actually sent to the District Council on the 17th July 2020 before being presented to committee for approval, in order to respond in his view, to the unacceptable and unreasonable tight deadlines set by District Council as the planning authority. He was of the view that the response should have been considered by the committee prior to being sent to the planning authority. Therefore, these reports should be acknowledged, not approved, and returned to officers to enable them to finish their important work without being put under pressure by the District Council or the developers.

He acknowledged that the Council had submitted a statutory application response, however, there remained so much more technical work and responses still to be undertaken, and the local planning authority needed to respect this. Accelerating the Council's responses would not benefit the long term community and residents of Northstowe or the already existing communities of Longstanton, Oakington and Westwick.

He reminded the Committee that the applicant, Homes England, was a public body. Therefore, the applications and development need to be exemplar. Homes England had a responsibility to set the standard for strategic site development, and not seek to accelerate determination, on a development that could quite possibly not even start for some 5 plus years. These applications were the final phases of Northstowe, which provided the last chance to get things right. They also constituted 50% of the new town with Homes England responsible for 85% of the whole development. It was therefore important that they were considered within the context of Phases 1 and 2. Understanding they were separate applications but shared physical and social, education and community infrastructure.

These applications were about place making. Comprehensive development needed to be a priority. Cohesive well served communities should emerge from this site. Education, transport, archaeology required proper and due consideration. The work needed to ensure any consent was able to be implemented. He acknowledged that because of ongoing Section 106 work, a report needed to be presented to committee or delegated to the Executive Director: Place and Economy, in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair, with the Local Member, to agree appropriate mitigation.

In conclusion, he explained that there was so much more work the Council's officers needed to complete to fully address this consultation, and they must be allowed that time, and not suffer from undue pressure from the planning authority to complete it early to the detriment and the wellbeing of residents. The B1050, Station Road, Phase 1 Northstowe, had already been identified as dangerous with two pedestrian crossings that needed to be crossed to access the schools. Phase 3b fed directly onto that road so safe designs and safety audits were required. Oakington Parish Council had made many complaints about the Southern Access

Road West. All these needed more time in order to create the new communities that were safe, and a great place to live in.

Councillor Hudson proposed the following amendment, seconded by Councillor Wotherspoon, to the recommendations to minutes 33 and 34 (additions in bold and deletions in strikethrough):

- a) **Acknowledge** ~~Endorse~~ the response as set out in Appendix 1 ~~of the report~~ **and inform the planning authority that the response is incomplete and that extra time is required to complete it satisfactorily. Officers to send a holding objection to SCDC as the planning authority**
- b) Delegate to the Executive Director, Place and Economy, ~~in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee~~ **along with the Local Member**, the authority to make minor changes to the **final** response.

The Chairman and Vice-Chairman apologised for not ensuring that Local Members had been consulted. The Chairman was aware that senior officers had also spoken to Councillor Hudson. He suggested that the District Council would have no problem waiting for a full consultation response, as it was the planning authority and would therefore be very keen to make sure all consultations had finished before it determined any planning applications. The Vice-Chairman welcomed the points made by the Local Member. He thanked the Council officers for all the work they had done on behalf of the County Council and existing and future residents. He felt that all Members were confident in the commitment shown by the officers.

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

- highlighted the fact that a new toolkit had been published called Building for a Healthy Life, which encouraged healthier lifestyles to be planned into new housing developments, and had been endorsed by Homes England.
- stressed the importance of the area from an archaeological perspective.
- reported that the rephrasing of the traffic lights in Willingham at Junction 8 had generated many complaints so it was hoped that it would not need changing again. Attention was drawn to Junction 11 in Cottenham, which was already the subject of intense controversy arising from the five year land developments including one by This Land. It was noted that a mini roundabout would be doubled in diameter, which would quadruple the area of black top next to the listed Moreton's Almshouses. It was hoped that if any mitigation was required it could be rolled in to one engineering operation.
- highlighted the fact that it stated in the report that "It is unclear why the north arm is so sited with a reverse alignment from Dry Drayton Road (west) to SARE (north), with the exception of a future proposal to achieve a 4th arm on the north east of the circulatory, which is not a material consideration at this time". It was reported that there was a significant amount of land between the A14 and Longstanton and Oakington so there was therefore concern that there might be a plan to develop that land as Northstowe grew.
- noted that "Figure 6.9 appears to be missing the northern arm of the SARW eastern roundabout (appears to be a feature, or rather a lack of a feature,

across a number of diagrams)". Members were informed that the Cambridge Equality Panel had expressed concern about the urban design of a cluster of roundabouts in close proximity. It was noted that officers were pursuing the design implications of the roundabouts particularly the risk of queuing between one roundabout and another. Another Member highlighted the need to see more information even though it was an OPA.

- highlighted Northstowe Phase 3B where it was stated that comments had been provided separately for Floods and Water. It was noted that the County Council had been sent a letter from Graham Moore, Planning Engineer, Middle Level Commissioners raising a number of concerns about the impact on the Swavesey drain system, which were being considered by officers.
- highlighted the need to consider the Section 106 ask in relation to the ability to provide 40% affordable housing.
- expressed concern about the adequacy of the green separation for Northstowe Phase 3A and the communities of Oakington and Westwick.
- highlighted the fact that the County Council was a landowner for Phase 3B, which was not referenced in the report. There was also concern that the highways design for this application had not received much public consultation. The Business Manager Growth and Development reported that although the Council was a major landowner, the Growth and Development Team was landownership blind and treated all applications the same so reports did not acknowledge if the Council was a landowner.

One Member reported that there had been multiple opportunities over a long period of time for the County Council to engage with all parties so these reports should therefore not come as a surprise. However, it was not clear why there had been a pressing need to submit a response two months ago and not circulate it to the Committee. It was therefore suggested that the Committee should consider a revised submission at a future meeting in order to include reference to all points raised.

The Business Manager Growth and Development reported that the word "revised" was misleading as this process was ongoing. The Committee had received a report because it was expected that a response would take longer than the 12 weeks allowed to respond to a planning application. The work relating to education and transport, as well as infrastructure would take a long time to complete and get right. It was expected that the Section 106 terms would be brought to Committee in December or January.

The Local Member explained that he did not want this report to come back to committee as it could be dealt with as set out in the proposed amended recommendations. A few Members expressed concern that significant changes to responses would be carried out behind the scenes. As it was important to get the response to this major application right, it was therefore essential that it was considered at the next meeting, and it was also suggested that a seminar on how best to resolve the issues should be arranged. Both the Executive Director: Place and Economy and the Business Manager Growth and Development reported that the points raised could be dealt with as technical follow up in order to avoid delaying the process. The revised response could then be circulated to the

Committee. The Chairman agreed to circulate the final response to the Committee, and urged all Members of the Committee, in the meantime, to send any comments to the Business Manager Growth and Development and her Team. **Action Required.**

It was resolved to:

- a) Acknowledge the response as set out in Appendix 1 and inform the planning authority that the response is incomplete and that extra time is required to complete it satisfactorily. Officers to send a holding objection to SCDC as the planning authority
- b) Delegate to the Executive Director, Place and Economy, with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee along with the Local Member, the authority to make minor changes to the final response.

34. NORTHSTOWE PHASE 3B - OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION RESPONSE

Members received a report detailing the officers' response to an outline planning application for up to 1,000 new dwellings at Northstowe Phase 3b.

It was resolved to:

- a) Acknowledge the response as set out in Appendix 1 and inform the planning authority that the response is incomplete and that extra time is required to complete it satisfactorily. Officers to send a holding objection to SCDC as the planning authority
- b) Delegate to the Executive Director, Place and Economy, with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee along with the Local Member, the authority to make minor changes to the final response.

35. ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN, TRAINING PLAN AND APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

The Committee considered its agenda plan, and training plan.

One Member drew attention to items 4 and 5 of the training plan and suggested that these sessions should be rearranged. Another Member commented that there was no reference to the County Council's response to the Government White Paper on Planning for the Future and suggested that it be added as an agenda item. It was suggested that a workshop should be held in November on the County Council's responsibilities in a major flood. **Action Required.**

It was resolved unanimously to review the agenda plan and training plan.

Chairman