

Environment and Green Investment Committee

Date: 16 September 2021

Time: 10.00am – 1.25pm

Venue: New Shire Hall

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

11. Apologies for Absence and Declarations of Interest

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Gay (Councillor Howitt substituting).

Councillors Gardener, Corney, Smith, Hathorn and Rae declared interests as Members of the County Council's Planning Committee in relation to the Anglian Water Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant Relocation project item. Councillor Bradnam also declared an interest in this item, as Local Member.

12. a) Minutes of the Environment & Green Investment Committee

The minutes of the meeting held on 1st July 2021 were agreed as a correct record.

b) Environment & Green Investment Committee Action Log

The Action Log was noted.

13. Petitions and Public Questions

No petitions or public questions were received.

Due to technical difficulties, it was agreed to take the following item out of sequence:

14. North East Cambridge Area – Transport Approach

The Committee considered a report on the County Council's approach to the assessment and consideration of traffic and transport impacts associated with proposed development within the North East Cambridge (NEC) Area Action Plan (AAP), which would form part of the statutory development plan. The County Council Transport teams had been assisting the councils in the preparation of the AAP, aiding understanding of the potential transport impacts, including the commissioning of further transport evidence and conveying the findings and implications of this to interested parties. Following consultation on a preferred option draft of the AAP from 27 July to 5 October 2020, the pre-submission document would be reported to both authorities later in the year.

As the existing highway network was at capacity, one of the key transport principles was that future developments would only be supported if they were delivered in such a way that did not result in additional car trips to the network. This would require developments to have design principles and standards which included sustainable travel enhancements and

demand management measures, incorporating reduced parking allocation/ration for employment and housing. The Committee's endorsement of this position and approach was sought.

An amendment was proposed by Councillor Hathorn, which would be an addition to the Transport Position Statement: *"Applications in the area must provide generous, secure and easy to use storage for cycles, e-bikes, cargo bikes, trailers and other active travel modes. There should be capacity for community storage of shared cycling facilities such as trailers and e-cargo bikes, and the infrastructure to support significant levels of commercial deliveries by cargo bike"*. The amendment was seconded by Councillor Ferguson.

Discussing the amendment:

- A Member asked if there were any other examples of this type of car free communities? It was noted that CB1 and the Biomedical campus were the best examples of communities with a high degree of sustainable mode share;
- A Member asked if the suggested amendment included all non-motorised users? It was confirmed that "other active travel modes" were included in the amendment;
- A Member commented that residents would still need to have parking for cars for journeys further afield. It was acknowledged that cars were sometimes the best option for some longer journeys. The congestion issue related to cars being used rather than more sustainable modes of transport, especially for shorter journeys;
- A Member commented that he would have preferred to have seen a "no car" proposal, rather than "low car", so that developer/potential tenants' expectations were managed appropriately. Officers acknowledged these points but advised that the position statement was that the Council would not be supporting any premature application which would involve additional car trips;
- A Member noted that GCP was made up of South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City Councils, and asked whether any contact had been made with Fenland and East Cambridgeshire District Councils regarding these proposals? Officers advised that Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils were leading, but there would be wider consultation with neighbouring Districts. The Member commented that he could not see any reference in paperwork to neighbouring authorities, which was disappointing, as there would be a ripple effect impacting on neighbouring councils. The Chair commented that inevitably any transport measure would impact further afield;
- A Member observed that whilst the proposals may work well for the first generation of residents, how would they be enforced with subsequent generations, noting that physical methods of controlling trips, including signalling or highways works, may be considered by stakeholders. It was noted that there was an opportunity to manipulate signalling so that the advantage of driving was lost, but this option would require further investigation. Additionally, in other areas trip budgets have been used to restrict further development, where trip budgets were not being met;
- A Member asked if there was sufficient mitigation to ensure that surrounding communities did not suffer from displacement parking, as experienced in Milton from parking restrictions at Cambridge Science Park. Officers agreed that it was important to look at the issue of parking holistically so that parking was not just displaced. The Member responded that unless parking mitigations were supported

by Civil Parking Enforcement, it was unlikely to be enforced by the Police. Good quality parking needed to be provided off site to avoid displacement parking. She also queried whether good quality secure parking off site was being considered, and it was confirmed that this was the case, including further Park & Ride sites;

- Noting that the report had gone to the Greater Cambridge Joint Planning Committee, a Member asked if it would be considered through the County Council's Highways & Transport Committee. It was confirmed that it would not;
- A Member supported the amendment, commenting that there needed to be active support for cycling including accessible cycle parking. She added that this was an exemplar new development, which would result in no additional cars on surrounding roads such as the A10. However, she cautioned that there were examples of where this had not worked well, such as Orchard Park, where minimising parking provision had resulted in indiscriminate parking on pavements, and this needed to be avoided.

The amendment was put to the vote, and carried by a majority.

Discussing the report:

- A Member commented that the aspiration for the development should be at a no car level to manage expectations, and this could be achieved. A change in attitudes and perceptions was required to see how people could live without being tied to their personal cars, using options such as shared/pooled cars. There needed to be acceptance that people need to get out of their personal cars and walk, cycle or use public transport;
- A Member commented that there were always situations where there was a legitimate need for personal cars in communities, e.g. for carers. Those communities with minimal parking facilities/no driveways had often suffered from everyone parking on roads, resulting in problems for emergency vehicles and waste collections. A number of other Members supported these comments, saying that provision needed to be made for carers, Blue Badge holders, etc. Another Member commented that such communities needed to be futureproofed with provision for electric vehicles and provision for those with disabilities.

Summarising, the Chair commented that the intention was for this area of Cambridge to not be reliant on private motor car, and this intention was strengthened by amendment.

It was resolved, by a majority, to:

1. Approve the approach to the assessment and consideration of traffic and transport impacts, and the associated transport position as set out within the paper (at paragraph 2.4);
2. Approve an addition to the Transport Position Statement that "Applications in the area must provide generous, secure and easy to use storage for cycles, e-bikes, cargo bikes, trailers and other active travel modes. There should be capacity for community storage of shared cycling facilities such as trailers and e-cargo bikes, and the infrastructure to support significant levels of commercial deliveries by cargo bike."

15. Northstowe Phase 3A and Phase 3B – Section 106 Agreements Draft Head of Terms

The Committee considered a report relating to two outline applications submitted by Homes England to South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) for up to 4,000 dwellings and up to 1,000 dwellings, Phases 3A and 3B respectively. Both developments would require works in kind and contributions to be paid to the County Council and District Council towards a range of infrastructure types to ensure that the impacts of the development are properly mitigated which would be secured through the Section 106 agreement. Officers had been working with SCDC to agree Heads of Terms, setting out the likely costs of contributions required.

A Member observed that the proposals would impact on neighbouring divisions such as Papworth & Swavesey. It was confirmed that there would be consultation with stakeholders in neighbouring divisions including Internal Drainage Boards (IDBs).

In response to Member questions, it was confirmed that:

- the typical build rate assumed about 250 units per year, and all were occupied. It was agreed that the exact figures would be circulated. Action required;
- all sums quoted would be index linked;
- the school sites were free, and that the schools were usually the first buildings to be developed, as they were a central feature for the community, along with any sports facility provision. The latter would be delivered by SCDC;
- In relation to the 25% trigger for pump priming for local bus services, Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) was now the passenger service authority for the county, and they were happy with the flexibility of the 25% trigger;
- That in terms of schools expansion, Northstowe was currently 4FE (four forms of entry), and this would expand to 12FE, with the potential for a further increase to 14FE. Land was already secured on the existing campus.

The Committee noted comments from the Local Member, Councillor Firouz Thompson, who advised that the local Parish councils still had concerns about particular flood and draining issues and would be asking the local lead flood authority to correspond with the local planning authority, SCDC, to ensure that these matters could be adequately resolved prior of the granting of the planning permission.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) approve the draft head of terms set out in paragraphs 2.3 to 2.12 and Table 1 and Appendix A in respect to the Northstowe Phase 3A Section 106 agreement.
- b) approve the draft head of terms set out in paragraphs 2.3 to 2.10 and Table 2 and Appendix A in respect to the Northstowe Phase 3B Section 106 agreement.
- c) gave delegated authority to the Executive Director in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair to agree the Section 106 agreements

16. Community Flood Action programme – Riparian Maintenance Fund

The Committee considered a report which sought agreement on the situations in which funding would be allocated to riparian owners to undertake one-off recovery/remedial works on privately owned watercourses, where they were unable to fund such works themselves. Members noted the scoring system that would be used to assess successful schemes, and that Local Member support would be required. The issue of absentee or unknown owners was highlighted, along with the benefits to residents and communities. In return for funding, successful applicants would be required to commit to keeping watercourses clear.

Arising from the report:

- One Member welcomed this pragmatic approach, but asked whether, in tandem, riparian responsibilities would be made clear to developers, and that this would also be flagged up in the subsequent sales of properties i.e. to new purchasers that they have a responsibility in this regard. She gave examples of recent developments where a responsible approach was not being taken by developers. Officers commented that this was a good point, which they would take away;
- In response to a Member question, it was confirmed that the identity of most riparian landowners could usually be confirmed through Land Searches, but some were difficult to establish. Where land was unregistered, this potentially presented an ongoing risk;
- Noted that the application form required a statement from the applicant that they were unable to undertake the work themselves;
- In response to a Member question, officers gave example of scenarios where ecology could be improved, e.g. through making good river banks destroyed by cattle and providing potential habitats for water voles, removing contamination such as flytipping, or just through clearing ditches and improving the flow;
- A Member stressed the importance of working with Parish and Town Councils and existing flood action groups, as such groups were often best placed to identify issues and solutions in their communities;
- Asked what happens if the agreement was not upheld, i.e. what avenues were open to the Council. Officers advised that the Council could reclaim the money from any applicants who did not undertake the work;
- Confirmed that the intention was that the scheme assisted those riparian owners unable to undertake the works themselves. Where the County Council was the riparian owner, it should be able to do the work itself. Members and residents should alert the Council if they were aware of issues on County owned land which were causing problems;
- Welcomed the proposals and highlighted that often homeowners were unaware of their riparian responsibilities. The Member commented that the twelve month review date for the programme was critical, given that this was a narrow window where work could be undertaken on watercourses in the county to address flooding issues;
- Noted how fraudulent applications would be avoided;
- Commented that the approach proposed was effectively means testing;

In response to a question on unspent highways budget, the Executive Director advised that he constantly monitored highways spend and that whilst some of the funding was not confirmed until late into financial year. He was unaware of any direct link between unspent highways budget and flooding.

Debating the report:

- A number of Members welcomed this scheme, but suggested that much more was needed to address the flooding issues experienced in the county. It was noted that this work was taking place alongside the work of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Flood and Water Partnership and individual Section 19 reports. One Member suggested that a bigger, bolder approach was required to tackle the county's flooding issues, and a serious look needed to be taken of infrastructure, which could not cope with surface water on occasions. Another Member suggested that as well as encouraging residents and landowners to take responsibility, the County Council needed to take greater responsibility for its own land;
- A Member commented that some developers were proactive in terms of their riparian responsibilities, and it would be helpful to have an update in 12 months' time to ascertain the success of the scheme;
- A Member commented that for some of fen edge/fenland communities, there was a responsibility to allow the land to flood, to prevent or alleviate flooding downstream – it needed to be accepted in some instances that some land needed to flood to protect property, and likewise some ditches need to be maintained at a high level during winter months;
- A Member welcomed the scheme and urged closer working with Internal Drainage Boards (IDBs) and Anglian Water, especially to tackle those developers who worsened these problems.

It was resolved, by a majority, to:

approve the recommended approach for riparian maintenance funding.

17. Anglian Water Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant Relocation Project

Members considered a report which presented the officer response to a recent Anglian Water consultation. The report also sought delegated powers for officers, where there was insufficient time to take the item to Committee, to ensure that the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) timescales could be met, allowing the Council's submissions to be given full weight by the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) in the determination process.

The Anglian Water proposal related to the relocation of Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant, from its current site on Cowley Road in Cambridge, to north of A14 near Junction 34/south of Horningsea. This relocation would enable the North East Cambridge development to proceed, which includes 8000 homes and associated jobs. The Anglian Water proposals include new habitats, wildlife, and improved access to the countryside, and a new discovery centre. NSIP projects are examined by the Secretary of State, and local authorities were statutory consultees, with a key role in providing local knowledge and informing to the Inspectorate. Anglian Water have undertaken two consultations on this matter to date, including an informal consultation exploring three possible sites. Officers' response to the

second consultation is included in the report at Appendix 3, and Members' comments would be included in the final response.

A Member observed that NSIPs appeared to be growing in popularity, and could be seen as an attempt to avoid local scrutiny and planning rules. Officers reassured Members that there was a team in place within the Council to ensure that NSIPs were being responded to promptly and accurately.

Councillor Bradnam declared an interest as the Local Member for Waterbeach, and expressed concerns regarding the transport routes. Whilst she was pleased that Option 2 had been discounted, she had concerns, particularly relating to 1a and 1b which would require access on to the B1047. Option 3 involved direct access on to the A14, but the current policy restricts junctions unless there was no clear alternative. She advised that local residents would strongly prefer Option 3 to be considered, to remove both development and tanker traffic from the small local roads. She queried the statement in the report that *"From a local road perspective, a new junction is likely to create different travel patterns, for vehicles avoiding Newmarket Road, or providing a convenient route to the east of Cambridge."* Officers explained that when access off the A14 was explored, there were a number of options, including a full movements junction and a slip junction. However, there was a risk that this would create a rat-running route for traffic. Councillor Bradnam commented that the sentence was ambiguous and suggested that it was clarified e.g. *"if not in the position indicated on the Option 3 plan"*.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) The Committee endorse the proposed officer technical response to Anglian Water's statutory consultation for the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant Relocation Project, set out in Appendix 3;
- b) The Executive Director: Place and Economy on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council be delegated authority to submit NSIP related responses in regard to the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant Relocation Project, to the Planning Inspectorate on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council and its regulatory functions, in consultation with the Chair or Vice Chair of the Environment and Green Investment Committee, only on occasions where there is not enough time for a report to be delivered to the Environment and Green Investment Committee; and
- c) Where delegated powers are used, circulate the draft response to Local Members and members of the Environment and Green Investment Committee ahead of sign off and submission to the Planning Inspectorate.

18. Low Carbon Heating Project at Burwell House

Members considered a proposal to replace the fossil fuel heating at Burwell House with low carbon Air Source Heat Pumps (ASHPs), which would reduce emissions by 24 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) per annum as part of the Council's "scope 1" target to reduce carbon emissions by 50%. This project formed part of a programme of retrofits in progress across a number of sites. The project was one of 21 awarded grant funding, and had received a grant of approximately £280K, but this had to be spent by March 2022. If all of the contingency budget was used, the total cost of the project would be £511K, exceeding the £500K limit previously agreed by Committee. The balance would be financed through the Environment Fund. The project payback was detailed. It was noted that the project implementation timetable was extremely challenging.

Discussing the report:

- It was noted that the windows at Burwell House had been replaced with double glazing last year;
- With regard to Grafham Water Residential Centre, a Member queried why that project had not been progressed. Officers advised that the buildings at Grafham were in need of additional works, so it would not be possible to complete the works within the timescale required for the grant, with the grant originally identified for that project being used for other projects where possible. The Member asked when Grafham Water Residential Centre was likely to come forward, specifically when grants would be applied for. Officers advised that further rounds of Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme grants were expected and that they would be looking to apply for more funding but not in the next tranche of government funding in October due to resource constraints;
- A Member observed that there was a great deal of volatility in building materials costs. It was confirmed that the quote was fixed, and there was contingency in the budget for any unforeseen additional costs;
- A Member asked if the opportunity had been taken to ask Centre users to perform energy review as part of the technical energy review. Officers confirmed that they do monitor usage of buildings in terms of energy consumption,;
- A Member suggested that future reports show where the Council was on the carbon reduction journey i.e. progress towards the carbon reduction target. **Action required;**
- A Member welcomed the continuing commitment by the County Council to outdoor education.

It was resolved unanimously:

- a) To approve the investment case set out in paragraph 2.10 and proceed with the project to install ASHPs and upgrades for the incoming electricity supply at Burwell House;
- b) To note the project risks set out in paragraphs 2.13-2.18;
- c) Delegate the decision to go into contract to the Executive Director of Place & Economy in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer and Chair and Vice-Chair of the Environment and Green Investment Committee.

19. Oxford-Cambridge Arc Spatial Framework, Sustainability Appraisal and Shared regional principles

The Committee considered the proposed response to a consultation about the “Ox Cam Arc”, an area identified as key economic priority by the government, covering Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire, Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire. The consultation was pitched at a very strategic level, and Councils invited to help shape the future vision for this large geographical area. MHCLG would be publishing a further

consultation in Spring 2022 on the options for the draft spatial framework, which would be published later in 2022.

The report included the associated sustainability appraisal, and acknowledged that officers were already engaged in the process, mindful of residents' concerns including cross boundary issues. The report detailed the need to involve wider stakeholders at an early stage, to consider Minerals and Waste issues, and how to progress at all tiers of decision making process, to create a combined approach with both the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority and City and District Council colleagues.

A Member commented that there was much in the draft response that should be strongly endorsed, including the comments on historic environment and barriers to housing. However, he suggested that the Ox Cam Arc should be strongly opposed, and referred to comments made under an earlier item about a weakening of the established planning system through NSIPs, as this was effectively transferring planning powers from local to national government. He queried how the Ox Cam Arc would add value for local people. There was reference to surveys and focus groups, but nothing about involving local Councils. If this was the way forward, local authorities should coordinate across the Arc, but the whole process needed to be in line with local planning processes.

It was also suggested that the draft wording on Carbon and Climate Change should be strengthened, because if it went ahead, there needed to be clear, measurable evidence that it would achieve its net zero objective. There should also be a stronger response on the development on brownfield sites, and lack of integration in proposals in terms of development and sustainability, with housing meeting carbon targets. The Member suggested that access to housing should be championed rather than "taken into account". Similarly, on Waste, circular economy principles should be adopted. Government would need to commit additional resources to achieve their aspirations.

Another Member supported the previous Member's comments, and observed that the main driver of the OxCam Arc was essentially the development of a million additional homes, with East West Rail and the A428 improvements being used as justification to unlock large areas of countryside, essentially changing the rural nature of eastern England. This was a particular issue in St Neots, where massive housing development was being planned in Bedfordshire, right on the county boundary.

Another Member agreed, commenting that his reservations about the proposals had been reinforced by the inconsistencies with government statements, as demonstrated by the proposal that East West Rail uses diesel locomotives. He also expressed concerns about Development Corporations driving new housing, with local authorities being detached from that process.

In response to a question about Neighbourhood Plans, officers confirmed that the danger was that the OxCam Arc proposals would include spatial vision and preferred options for housing growth that were not based on the usual evidence for the planning process, i.e. a "top down" rather than "bottom up" approach would be taken, rather than the Local Plan driving the development process. The principles needed to be strengthened so that planning must be led by the Local Plan, can strengthen that in the response. Is complex planning picture, summary is risk being done to by a top down approach to regional planning.

The Chair summarised the concerns raised regarding the top down principles of this government initiative. Whilst reassured by the general principles and the Growth response, insufficient detail had been provided in the consultation. Whilst the Council would be

responding, it was not endorsing this approach, and the position was that this must be led through local planning and democratic processes.

It was resolved unanimously to endorse the proposed response set out in Appendix A of the report, subject to any changes delegated to the Executive Director: Place and Economy, in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Environment and Green Investment Committee, to allow a response to be submitted before the consultation deadline of Tuesday 12 October.

20. Finance Monitoring Report

The Committee received the Finance Monitoring report for the Place and Economy directorate as at 31 July 2021. The Revenue position was a forecast underspend of £205K. It was noted that the waste service had been allocated £638K to reflect the estimated impact of Covid, but the majority of that funding may not be required for this specific purpose. However, that funding would instead be directed to help address other in-year pressure in the waste budget.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Review, note and comment on the Finance and Monitoring report.

21. Business Planning Proposals for 2022-27 – opening update and overview

The Executive Director: Place & Economy introduced a report on the business planning process and the context for that process in the coming months. The report set out the backdrop to that process including zero carbon, social value, underpinning the Business Planning process. Section 5.2 of the report listed those areas being explored for investment and savings, and those issues would be prepared and brought back to the next Committee meeting.

Arising from the report:

- A Member asked how the £64M deficit would be dealt with over the next four years. Officers advised that the focus would be to identify scope for savings to be made, based on the Joint Administration's priorities, and where scope to strengthen services for investment. Through preparation of business cases, there would be a similar process at each Policy & Service Committee, where savings against priorities for investment would be considered, and this which would inform the Business Planning process in January and February;
- A Member queried the scale up of the schools low carbon heating programme, and whether that would include Academy schools. Officers confirmed that there would be a consultancy offer to Academy schools, in line with the report presented to the July Committee meeting;
- A Member commented that his aspiration was to move to a triple bottom line accounting, i.e. consideration of Finance, Social Capital and Environment Capital. He felt that this was the right way forward and that officers were interested and wanted to move in that direction. He urged Members to consider this approach if they were committed to the Council's net zero aspirations.

It was resolved unanimously:

- a) Note the overview and context provided for the 2022-23 to 26-27 Business Plan
- b) Comment on the list of proposals (set out in section 5.2) and endorse their development

22. Waste Management PFI Contract – Variations to Waterbeach Facility Permits

Members considered a report which related to changes required at Waterbeach waste processing facilities, to ensure that they were compliant with the Industrial Emissions Directive, enabling the site to maintain its Environmental Permits and allow continued operation and treatment of waste collected at Household Recycling Centres and by city and district councils. The operator of the site, Amey, had proposed measures to reduce odours, and the Council's contract with the operator required Amey to not be worse off as a result. The long term benefit would be significant reduction in odour emission from both plants. If works were not implemented, waste processing would have to stop at these sites, and waste would need to be sent to landfill. The funding and contractual implications were outlined.

Councillor Bradnam spoke as Local Member. She was happy to support this proposal, and whilst understanding the costs were likely to be considerable, she advised that residents would be extremely pleased with any improvements to reduce odour from the plant, which was a very present concern for Waterbeach residents. Improvements would also benefit the lives of future residents of Waterbeach New Town too.

Arising from the report:

- A Member suggested that an amendment be added for the Committee to receive regular updates, and this was agreed unanimously;
- A Member commented that it would be preferable to opt for Public Works Loan Board borrowing;
- A Member queried timescales. It was also noted that this was detailed in paragraphs 2.2 and 2.3 of the report. The Environmental Permit required the works to be completed by August 2022. The operator was already looking at what could be done without planning permission, and would be presenting to a Liaison Meeting on 6 October.
- A Member noted that MBT preferred option 2 did not guarantee it would meet the required odour standard, and asked the level of risk. Officers advised that technical consultants had been engaged to review the options and quantify the residual risk, and colleagues from the Environment Agency had also been involved. There would always be an element of risk, but this would be reduced as far as possible. Additionally, lenders would also be looking for some security on what was being delivered.

It was resolved unanimously:

- a) Support the proposals outlined in this report and recommend to the Strategy and Resources Committee that it approves the capital and revenue spend outlined in Confidential Appendix 2 to this report.
- b) delegate responsibility to the Executive Director Place and Economy in consultation with the Committee Chair and Vice chair to:
- c) commission the relevant specialist advisors to review the proposed amendments, the associated costs and the Council's contractual liabilities.
- d) commit the necessary internal resources to support waste officers to manage the project, agree and deliver the required amendments to the infrastructure and the Waste Private Finance Initiative (PFI) Contract.
- e) evaluate options and select the technical solution that is most likely to meet the emissions limits without incurring excessive cost.
- f) submit a Variation Business Case to the Department for Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) to obtain agreement to vary the Waste PFI Contract where required.
- g) agree the amendments required to the Waste PFI Contract.
- h) provide regular updates to Committee Chair and Vice Chair on key issues as the project progresses
- i) That the Committee receive regular updates.

23. Environment & Green Investment Committee Agenda Plan and Training Plan and Appointments to Outside Bodies and Internal Advisory Groups and Panels

Members considered the Committee's Agenda Plan. It was confirmed that a Flood Risk workshop for all Members was being planned.

It was resolved unanimously to note the agenda plan