

Environment and Green Investment Committee

Date: 20 January 2022

Time: 10.00am – 13.15pm

Venue: New Shire Hall

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

42. Apologies for Absence and Declarations of Interest

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Tierney.

Councillor Bradnam declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 7 as a South Cambridgeshire District Councillor.

Councillor Milnes declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 7 as a South Cambridgeshire District Councillor and Cabinet Member.

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

The minutes of the meeting held on 16th December 2021 were agreed as a correct record.

b) Environment & Green Investment Committee Action Log

The Action Log was noted.

44. Petitions and Public Questions

No petitions or public questions were received.

45. Annual carbon footprint report 2020-21

The Committee considered a report on the carbon footprint for the County Council for the year 2020-21, and for Cambridgeshire as a county for 2019. The report included annual carbon footprint calculations and additional agreed actions.

The report summarised the Council's greenhouse gas emissions for 2020-21, and the county's emissions for 2019 which was the most recent data available. For the County footprint the methodologies used to identify the carbon footprint included BEIS's dataset of CO₂ emissions by geographical area, which enabled comparisons with other areas of the UK. The BEIS dataset had been revised significantly since the previous year, using an improved methodology for the Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF) sector. The Cambridgeshire figures, both per capita and per km², were higher than the national average, mainly due to land use. Other sectors show a slight decline in emissions compared to previous years.

In terms of the Council's own emissions, 2020-2021 was an exceptionally unusual year, with lower emissions, mainly due to a reduction in construction activity for major capital building works, such as building new schools, due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Transport was also showing a substantial reduction, down by 62%, again due to reduced activity because of the pandemic. However, this downward trajectory is not expected to continue, the expectation is that construction and transport emissions will bounce back as pandemic measures are lifted.

A key change to the report was land use emissions for the Council's own land, which was included for the first time. Scope 1 and 2 emissions from the Council's assets was 20% lower than the previous year, partly due to more renewable electricity, a milder winter, less electricity for street lighting and lower fleet activity due to the pandemic.

Arising from the report:

- A Member asked if there had been an audit of effectiveness of the Balfour Beatty streetlighting contract, and whether the new streetlighting had resulted in less electricity consumption due to improved technologies. It was confirmed that this was the case, and there had also been a reduction in the number of streetlights. Officers agreed to circulate this information to the Committee. **Action required;**
- A Member requested information on progress versus planned actions in future reports. It was agreed that information would be prepared for the Committee, outlining what interventions had been implemented over the last year and what benefits had been delivered as a result of those interventions. **Action required;**
- Noting that the report referenced a number of gaps in information, a Member asked what was being done to plug those gaps to ensure that the information was available in future? It was noted that Cambridgeshire was already reporting more than most local authorities, as the majority only reported on Scope 1 and 2 emissions. Nonetheless, officers were working with colleagues and partners to fill the gaps in the information provided. However, it was recognised that some of the data was beyond the direct control of the Council and there would inevitably still be gaps going forward;
- A Member had had difficulty finding the previous Carbon Footprint reports on the County Council's website, and it was agreed that the link would be circulated to the Committee. **Action required;**
- A Member noted that land use and forestry was the most intractable element within the data, and asked whether it was fair for the Council to keep that element within its carbon footprint targets. In terms of policy, it was noted that land use was a Rural Estates policy issue, and Rural Estates colleagues are working hard to identify nature based solutions to reduce carbon emissions as well as working with tenants on farming practices, etc. The county's significant peat reserve had potential to deliver environmental benefits, so should be viewed positively;
- With regard to land use changes and forestry in particular, there was a question on whether the latest methodologies were being used, and also whether there were changes to the county's carbon footprint which were out of the Council's control, or were due to specific circumstances e.g. the pandemic. It was suggested that these elements needed to be made clearer to the public in the report. It was also suggested that the data needed to be effectively smoothed e.g. the anomalous 2020 figures in calculating averages, to ensure a consistent picture was being presented

in the medium term. In discussion, it was also suggested that it needed to be made clear that Scope 3 emissions were not in the direct control of the Council. In terms of explaining changes year on year, officers explained that this would partly be achieved through the narrative in the accompanying report, and trend analysis could also be presented;

- Two Members commented that it would be useful to have a summary for both Committee Members and the public, using infographics, for those unable to undertake a deep dive into the data. This could also highlight anomalous data, such as that attributable to the pandemic. **Action required.**

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) accept the annual carbon footprint report as a record of the Council's greenhouse gas emissions for the financial year April 2020 to March 2021;
- b) publish the report on the Council's climate change pages on the website.

46. Cambridge University Science and Policy Exchange 2021: a Cambridgeshire Decarbonisation Fund (Part 2)

The Committee considered a report detailing the plans for the Cambridgeshire Decarbonisation Fund, which aimed to speed up carbon emission regulations by collaborating with public sector partners and businesses, and establishing a Decarbonisation Fund and Carbon Advisory Service for SMEs (Small and Medium Sized Enterprises).

A number of Members commended the championing of CUSPE by former County Councillor Ian Manning, and suggested it may be worth have a CUSPE Champion going forward.

Officers highlighted that the CUSPE researchers were not paid consultants, and had given up time from their doctorate studies to build skills and insights into how local authorities work, and play a role in helping to develop environmental policy. Many of the CUSPE researchers had scientific backgrounds, but not necessarily in environmental policy.

The focus of the detailed development work was on understanding how the Decarbonisation Fund could work for businesses; how projects could 'sell' carbon credits, and what the funding model would look like. The intention was also to progress the accreditation of the Swaffham Prior scheme so that carbon credits could be sold.

The Committee received a presentation from CUSPE researchers Buffy Eldridge-Thomas, Andrew Smith and Robert Pearce-Higgins on Carbon Advisory Service and Business Decarbonisation. It was agreed that their PowerPoint presentation would be appended to the minutes. **Action required.**

Members noted:

- The initial project brief to present a strategic business case for the establishment of a Decarbonisation Fund to sell carbon credits to Cambridgeshire businesses, and how this was focused on hard to treat emissions for businesses;

- How Carbon Advisory Services could help businesses calculate and reduce their emissions, but there appeared to be a lack of unified guidance. The first recommendation was to establish a local Carbon Advisory Service (CAS), similar to those currently provided in Norfolk and Suffolk. The services which would be provided were outlined;
- There were two possible approaches for delivering these services, either in-house or working with partners to offer “Council approved” advice and accreditation;
- Purchasing carbon credits would be used to help decarbonise businesses and invest in decarbonisation projects now that could bring benefits to the area;
- Validation and verification of projects is important for businesses. This needed to be undertaken by an independent third party, and there were already well-recognised standards and organisations to undertake these functions;
- The long term (40 year) financial model that has been developed would require up-front funding such as grants or borrowing (PWLB) from multiple sources, this would be phased out as the Fund became profitable and self-sustaining. The ultimate aim was that projects would be funded from previous projects;
- Projects should predominantly be those which were not otherwise financially viable.

Arising from the presentation:

A Member queried the verification and validation aspects, suggested there could be lot of pressure for potential projects to misrepresent their objectives. Officers commented that businesses want fair processes so that they know when they buy carbon credits that they were genuinely reducing carbon emissions. There needed to be independent verification and validation to provide assurance to those that buy credits that projects were appropriately accredited. The intention was that this would be targeted at hard to treat emissions.

A Member asked if consideration had been given to working with Suffolk and Norfolk, who already have established CASs? It was noted that building on the experience of Norfolk and Suffolk on CASs should be explored to prevent reinventing the wheel and that if Norfolk and Suffolk do not have Decarbonisation Funds offering carbon credits that extending the Fund to include Norfolk and Suffolk could be helpful.

A Member asked how partners, including the District Councils and the CPCA, could align objectives and avoid duplicating efforts on these issues. The example was given of housing development, alluded to in the presentation, which was a District Council responsibility. It was confirmed that this work had been shared with partners, and officers would work with colleagues at the CPCA and District Councils to align. It was also envisaged that the CAS would help remove the potentially onerous administrative burden that SMEs and micro businesses may be facing when implementing carbon saving measures. It was noted that SMEs and micro businesses were not required by law to demonstrate that they were transitioning to a low-carbon economy, as larger companies were. However, they were being asked to demonstrate low carbon emissions in other contexts, for example when working with larger companies, who required the data relating to Scope 3 emissions for their supply chains. There were also potential cost saving incentives for SMEs and micro businesses to lower emissions.

A Member observed that the County Council's budget was already under pressure, and asked whether it was realistic to expect this scheme to be set up, especially if PWLB funding was required. Officers advised that there had been early stage discussions with finance colleagues, who had made comments on the funding model. More detailed work was required on the finance arrangements for the Fund, of which PWLB was one of the options to be explored along with other potential funding streams. The critical element was generating suitable projects.

The Chair observed that this project started out about funding, and had evolved into a proposal for the creation of an advisory service. It had become very clear that businesses were crying out for reliable trustworthy information in relation to decarbonisation, and she wholeheartedly endorsed this development. It would be vital to work closely with partners, including the Combined Authority, to achieve these outcomes.

Researchers were thanked for their excellent presentation and hard work on this project.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the Cambridgeshire University Science and Policy Exchange (CUSPE) 2021 research report on a Cambridgeshire Decarbonisation Fund attached as Appendix A;
- b) Agree next steps as set out in paragraph 2.8 of the report.

47. Cambridge University Science and Policy Exchange 2021: Local Area Energy Planning: Evidence base for heat zoning

The Committee considered a report detailing the findings of a CUPSE research project on Local Area Energy Planning. The project focussed on establishing an evidence base for heat networks and heat zones, and aimed to identify and designate areas within which heat networks were the lowest cost low carbon solution for decarbonising heating and hot water for homes and non-domestic buildings. A better understanding of the evidence required and how easy it was to obtain this data would inform resource and skills planning for Local Authorities ahead of the Government's heat zoning legislation.

The Committee received a presentation from CUSPE researchers Grace Field, Hannah Galbraith-Olive and Lizzie Knight, and noted the following points:

- Why heating needed to be decarbonised: 80% of domestic energy demand was for space and water heating, most of which was currently supplied by gas. There were proven technologies to reduce carbon emissions from heating;
- Heat networks were one of the most cost effective ways to heat communities, and were usually provided by ground or air source heat pumps. Examples of heat network projects currently in place across the UK were noted, most of which include back up alternative energy sources. Energy centres were usually located on government owned land;
- Eventually all businesses and homes need to be heated through decarbonised heat;
- Maps were shown, illustrating which postcodes had higher than average gas consumption in the three priority towns of Huntingdon, Ely and March. Researchers explained the rationale for the selection of possible zones and location of energy

centres but the wider policy context had not been explored such as Fuel Poverty or health which could be important factors informing heat zones;

- The proposed next steps, including stakeholder engagement, ensuring that heating decarbonisation was a priority in local plans, and undertaking a full technical analysis of the proposed heat networks.

Arising from the presentation:

A Member urged caution on basing the location of energy zones on areas of greatest demand, as these could be the most affluent areas and/or areas of greatest waste or poorest insulation. He suggested that energy zones be located in areas of the greatest need, especially in light of escalating energy prices. Officers commented the wider indices of Multiple Deprivation needed to be applied as part of the next steps of analysis. Researchers agreed.

Whilst acknowledging that the three towns in the study was a starting point, it was pointed out that there may be “low hanging fruit” in other areas of the county. It was noted that this was the first step, and the focus was on establishing the process and specifying the type of information required. Those Local Members present (Councillors J King, Gowing and Coutts) all commented that the areas identified in the three market towns they represented tended to be more affluent areas of those towns. It was stressed that these three areas were case studies only.

Members raised other examples of district heat systems, such as Eddington, and the geothermal project at Eden Project. It was confirmed that due to the local geology, there was not the option of deep geothermal projects such as Eden Project in Cambridgeshire.

A Member asked if there was an optimum size of housing development for heat networks. Officers suggested that new developments or extensions to towns were good opportunities for heat networks as installing heat networks in new developments is easier than retrofitting. Once in place, the heat network can be extended into the town or local area to support existing buildings. The Local Plan will be an important policy document for identifying potential opportunities for heat networks.

A Member asked how easy it was for properties to connect to heat networks, and the extent of modification required to existing systems required by homeowners. It was noted that it was easy to connect existing water based (e.g. gas or oil) central heating technology, and those systems would require no or little modification, but for properties heated only by electricity (e.g. storage heaters), significant retrofitting would be required. It was noted that in Swaffham Prior, there was a range of existing technologies, including electrically heated homes and oil central heating system. It was also noted that new housing developments could be heated on the low temperature systems, but older housing was likely to need good insulation and higher temperature heat pumps.

A number of Members highlighted that there were other examples locally, including other sustainable heat methods such as MVHR (Mechanical Ventilation with Heat Recovery), and stressed the importance of working with partners. It was suggested that a strategic view needed to be taken, as often District authorities were focused on new technologies for heating systems in new developments, rather than on retrofit of homes using traditional gas/oil central heating based systems. However, given the information provided, it appeared that traditional heating systems could be more easily adapted to heat networks and needed further work. Another Member suggested that local planning authorities

needed to consider options such as heating networks when major housing developments were being planned.

A Member commented on the links to the previous item, suggesting that once a scheme was up and running, such as Swaffham Prior, it would be possible to sell off carbon credits and reinvest that revenue in other schemes. Officers confirmed that a range of projects would be supported by the Decarbonisation Fund, including heat networks, although the latter are complex to deliver.

The Chair commented that this was clearly an issue that the Council could not tackle on its own, and the research needed to be reviewed with partners to see how it could inform the development of heat networks in the county. Local Area Energy Planning could then be included in the Combined Authority's Climate Action Plan. Some of these proposals would involve retrofitting, and there was a general consensus that a "fabric first" approach should be developed in tandem with heat network development.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the Cambridgeshire University Science and Policy Exchange (CUSPE) 2021 research report on Local Area Energy Planning: Evidence base for heat zoning, attached as Appendix A to the report;
- b) Agree the next steps as set out in paragraph 2.7 of the report.

48. Greater Cambridge Local Plan: First Proposals (Regulation 18) Consultation Response

The Committee considered a report detailing the "First proposals" consultation for the Greater Cambridge Local Plan. The Local Plan was being prepared jointly by Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils. This was the first statutory stage of the process, and the purpose of the consultation was to set out the preferred options, and for consultees to comment on the emerging strategy.

It was stressed that this was very much a technical officer response at this stage. Internal consultations had been undertaken across County Council service areas, and a formal officer response had been submitted prior to the statutory deadline in December. The shared planning service was aware that comments made by officers were dependent on the Committee's endorsement. Responses had been received from Education, Flood & Water, Minerals & Waste and Transport Strategy teams, and those responses were included in the response appended to the report. Following consideration of these consultations, a full draft plan would be prepared by Greater Cambridge Shared Planning later in the year.

Arising from the report:

A Member asked how existing villages would be protected when new developments were brought forward. The Member's main concern was flooding, but she also had concerns regarding issues such as transport. Officers confirmed that the protection of villages had been picked up by the Flood and Water and Transport Strategy teams, and indicated that the flooding issue had specifically been picked up by the County Council in its role as lead local flood authority. Generally, the amount of growth in villages was fairly limited, and most new development was focused on Cambridge East, plus new allocations at Cambourne, increased densification at Eddington, and accelerated build out at Waterbeach and Northstowe. Planning authorities were trying to achieve a balance, especially in terms

of strategic developments. The Member commented that developments such as those referred to could still have significant impacts in terms of issues such as flooding and transport on neighbouring villages.

A Member drew attention to the section on Education in relation to the NE Cambridge site. This acknowledged formal sports playing facilities would largely be delivered off site, as it needed to be a dense urban development to be viable, but that the Council preferred on site sports facilities. The Member asked if that view could be strengthened, e.g. where there was County Council land, could the Council have some safeguarding of land for provision of outdoor sports space for formal recreation, both for children and young people but also for wider community? In response, officers confirmed NE Cambridge would be a very dense urban development due to the high cost required to relocate the sewage works. The drawback of that approach was that planning authorities would need to be flexible in applying the usual sports and green space standards, as there was huge pressure on land to deliver housing, which was why some facilities may need to be located off site. It was acknowledged that the size of the facilities provided would not reflect the size of the schools. If facilities were not provided on site, some compensatory land elsewhere would need to be allocated, and officers indicated that they were happy to follow up on this point. Officers advised that planning authorities should be planning green areas and leisure facilities within their sites or in administrative areas. This issue would be raised with colleagues outside the meeting.

A Member noted that the report stated that there were no significant implications for communities, quality of life and children, which appeared incorrect given the issues raised e.g. provision of sports and recreational space. It was clarified that this was because the decisions on planning issues were not being taken by the Committee. The Member also specifically supported the issue of importance of playing fields and sports facilities.

For the creation of developments where cars were discouraged, there was an issue with earlier developments such as Orchard Park where there were not facilities for storing cargo bikes, etc, and a Member asked if there was an opportunity to retrofit those developments with these facilities. Officers responded that there were unlikely to be opportunities under Section 106 funding for cycle storage on existing developments, so any such projects would need to be pursued outside of the planning process.

Regarding freight and delivery, steps should be taken to ensure major providers did not have a monopoly e.g. to locker storage solutions for deliveries. Officers responded that these issues often came up in quality panels, when architects were reviewing developments, and that point could be made to the District Councils to see if it could be addressed.

A Member commented that it would be helpful if infrastructure not in the ownership of local authorities listed contact information e.g. lampposts owned by housing associations. Officers agreed to would raise this issue with the Asset Management team.

A Member commented that it would be helpful to encourage reduce and repair organisations to set up in developments such as NE Cambridge, which were usually discouraged in and around Cambridge due to high rents.

Asked if reference to zero or ultra low emission zones could be added e.g. for NE Cambridge, which would have the added benefit of assisting in terms of air quality in new developments. Officers agreed to raise this issue with partners, but it may be outside the remit of the Local Plan. Another Member asked if the issue could be raised on the road hierarchy, specifically 20mph zones, and whether the Council could comment on that as

highways authority. Officers advised that there may be scope for the delivery of 20mph zones, but this would be a matter for the Highways Authority under separate legislation. It was agreed this would be recorded in the minutes and picked up with partners.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Endorse the consultation response to the Greater Cambridge Local Plan (First Proposals) as set out in Appendix 1 of the report; and
- b) Delegate to the Executive Director (Place and Economy) in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee the authority to make minor changes to the response.

49. Finance Monitoring Report – November 2021

The Committee received the November 2021 Finance Monitoring Report. Introducing the report, the presenting officer highlighted that Place and Economy was currently forecasting a £52,000 overspend for the year end. There were no significant Revenue issues to update Committee on. There had been some changes in forecast for energy schemes under Capital, which were detailed in Appendix 6 to the report.

There was a Member question on the Busway Litigation issue, and it was agreed that this was outside of the remit of the Committee, and questions relating to that issue could be taken up with Highways & Transport Committee.

Using the example of the St Ives Park & Ride solar scheme, a Member noted that the Committee had previously been advised of a reduction in construction materials prices. He sought reassurance that this was being monitored, as his own professional experience indicated that construction materials prices were reducing. Officers confirmed that they worked closely with procurement colleagues and also Bouyges, and they would ensure this was followed up. **Action required.**

It was resolved unanimously to:

Note the contents of the report.

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

The Committee noted its Agenda Plan, Training Plan and appointments to Outside Bodies and Internal Advisory Groups.

The following changes to appointments were agreed:

- Appoint Councillor Gardener to the Green Investment Group, to replace Councillor J King;
- Appoint Councillor Coutts as Cllr Dupré's deputy to the meeting of the Anglian (Great Ouse) Regional Flood and Coastal Committee on Thursday 27 January.

A number of additions and changes were noted to the Agenda Plan, and it was agreed that a revised Agenda Plan would be circulated to Members. **Action required.**

51. Digital Connectivity Infrastructure Strategy Refresh and Connecting Cambridgeshire Programme

The Committee received a report detailing the updated Digital Connectivity Infrastructure Strategy and the Connecting Cambridgeshire programme. It was noted that the report contained a confidential appendix, and the Committee agreed to move into private session when that appendix was discussed, but as much as possible would be discussed in public session.

The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Digital Connectivity Infrastructure Strategy 2021-2025 had been approved by the CPCA's Housing and Communities Committee in November 2021. The Strategy built on previous work, but included updated stretch targets and objectives to better meet the needs of businesses and communities, and provide future proofed solutions.

The report also detailed the Superfast Broadband (SFBB) gap funding contracts, for which the County Council was the accountable body for both Peterborough and Cambridgeshire. The aim of this contract was to ensure that more rural (and hence less commercially profitable) areas of the county still enjoyed good SFBB connectivity. These contracts had taken longer than originally envisaged, but had been taken further as it had been possible to draw more government and EU funding.

The first contract was now in closedown with an underspend declared, , for which the Council's portion is around £900,000. The second contract was ongoing and would complete in late 2022. There was a clawback mechanism, whereby any excess profits were allocated to an investment pot. Take-up had been extremely good, and it was expected that when that fund matures, the remaining amount would be divided up among HM Treasury and the two Councils in line with the original agreement.

Arising from the report:

- A Member queried the terminology, specifically definition of "superfast", given the speeds quoted of 24mbps did not seem that high. It was confirmed that the contracts were based on 24mbps, but communities now need full fibre solutions, and new higher targets were being set accordingly;
- A Member asked how the rollout of fibre and greater bandwidth to rural villages would be achieved and prioritised. Officers confirmed this was a key objective of this project, and there were now a number of commercial operators also looking to roll out to rural areas of the county, in addition to the area being a pilot for the Government's Project Gigabit programme which will provide funding for difficult to reach areas which would otherwise not be commercially viable;
- A Member asked if there were SLAs in place on availability, which was a key issue, e.g. for online meetings. Officers could not comment as contractual arrangements for IT Services sat with the Council's IT team, but generically, service delivery at a regulatory level was the responsibility of Ofcom;
- It was noted that analogue phone lines would be ending in 2026, and it was suggested that a seminar would be worthwhile, as many Members were unaware that this was the case. Officers advised that they would have further information available on this issue later in the year;

- A Member observed that there was considerable emphasis on business, but less on education, and the last two years had demonstrated how important connectivity was for students, especially those from low income backgrounds. She asked if the data was available on how many students did not have connectivity. Officers agreed that at the early stages of the pandemic, connectivity had been poor, and detailed how students had been supported. Public access Wifi was available through 200 free hubs across the county, and officers agreed to circulate a link mapping those locations. **Action required;**
- In response to a Member question, it was noted that the take-up rate across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough exceeded 76%, which was one of the reasons that more commercial providers had been encouraged to enter the market locally. However, there were still known gaps, especially for social housing;
- A Member observed that poor customer service could often be a barrier to connectivity. Officers agreed, and advised that whilst complaints should go to Ofcom, they were happy to signpost individuals when they had a complaint;
- A Member advised that there was a new housing development in her division, and some of the homes did not have connectivity. It was agreed that officers would follow up on this individual case. **Action required.**
- A Member asked if District Councils were consulted about 5G phone masts, as Districts were often uneasy about 5G applications and were frequently unaware that they were coming forward. Officers advised that there would be seminars and information packs later in the year so that Members had a greater awareness in relation to the 5G roll out. It was confirmed that under the current statutory framework, providers were able to deploy 5G masts under permitted development regulations up to a certain height, and they did not necessarily have to inform planning authorities, depending on the context of what was being undertaken. It was agreed that officers would provide further written detail on this point. **Action required.**

The following points were raised in discussion:

- A number of Members were interested in the cessation of copper/analogue network, and expressed concern that some residents, especially the elderly, may be reliant on landline. They were also concerned on the implications if there was an electrical outage in a disaster scenario, particularly flooding. Officers advised that there were emerging standards that require battery back up in particular situations, but this would only be for a certain period of time. Officers shared Members' concerns, and agreed that these concerns needed to be flagged up with DCMS, especially on flooding issues;
- A Member commented that there was a huge social justice element given that rural communities often did not have high speed internet connectivity, which had impacts in terms of reduced access to employment (i.e. working from home), education and entertainment. It was vital that rural communities had the same opportunities;
- A Member commented that it would be better if an independent party provided 5G phone masts, and the numbers were therefore limited. It was important to have discussions on 5G masts at a community level, and it would be helpful to publicise to

District and Parish Councils that there was a Strategy coming forward later in the year.

It was resolved unanimously:

- a) Note and endorse the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Digital Connectivity Infrastructure Strategy 2021-2025 which was recently approved by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority's Housing and Communities Committee;
- b) Note the progress of the Superfast Broadband rollout;
- c) Note the progress of the Light Blue Fibre joint venture organisation with the University of Cambridge and Cambridgeshire County Council

Exclusion of Press and Public

It was resolved unanimously that:

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