

CABINET

21 July 2026
5.30 - 7.19 pm

Present: Councillors Thornburrow (Chair), Moore (Vice-Chair), Smart, Todd-Jones, Bird, Gawthrope Wood and Nestor

Other Councillors present: Bennett, Bick, Porrer, Tong, Whitmore, Young

In attendance online: Councillors Haithcock and Illingworth

Officers: Assistant Director and Head of Legal Practice: Tom Lewis
Head of Governance and Democracy & Deputy Monitoring Officer:
Dan Kalley.

Shared Planning Services Officers:

Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development: Stephen Kelly
Deputy Director Planning: Heather Jones
Planning Policy Manager: Jonathan Dixon
Team Leader, Strategy & Economy: Terry De Sousa
Team Leader, Strategy & Economy: Max Laverack
Team Leader, Strategy & Economy: Stuart Morris
Team Leader, Strategy & Economy: Lauren Wilkinson
Team Leader, Strategy & Economy: Lizzie Wood

South Cambridgeshire District Council:

Bridget Smith Leader of the Council
Brian Milnes Deputy Leader of the Council
Henry Batchelor Lead Cabinet Member for Planning
John Batchelor Lead Cabinet Member for Housing
Laurence Damary-Homan Lead Cabinet Member for Environment
Ed Sanders Lead Cabinet Member Corporate Resources
Peter McDonald Lead Cabinet Member for Economic Development
Dr Lisa Redrup Lead Cabinet Member for Healthy Communities
Natalie Warren-Green Lead Cabinet Member for Resources

Councillor Dr Richard Williams was in attendance by invitation.

Councillors Heather Williams and Anna Bradnam were in attendance.

Councillors Dr Adam Bostanci, Farhan Hussain and Michael Booth were in attendance online.

Officers in attendance for all or part of the meeting:

Chief Executive: Liz Watts

Monitoring Officer: Nurainatta Katevu

Political Assistant – Liberal Democrats: James Green

Democratic Services Officer: Habbiba Peacey

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

26/45/Cab Apologies

The sitting of the two Cabinets from Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils was introduced by Councillor Thornburrow, Leader of Cambridge City Council and Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport.

Following introductions, Councillor Bridget Smith formally opened the South Cambridgeshire District Council Cabinet meeting.

No apologies were received from Cambridge City Council Cabinet Members.

There were no apologies for absence from South Cambridgeshire District Council Cabinet Members.

26/46/Cab Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were received from Cambridge City Council Cabinet Members.

No declarations were received from South Cambridgeshire District Council Cabinet Members.

26/47/Cab Public Questions

At 5.39pm, Cambridge City Council's Cabinet reconvened, following consideration by South Cambridgeshire District Council's Cabinet of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee report from 14 July 2026, to consider and respond to two public questions, including supplementary questions. The same questions had also been submitted to South Cambridgeshire District Council's Cabinet.

Question 1:

Camcycle welcomes improvements to the cycle parking policies in the Local Plan which will enable many more people of all ages and abilities in our region to ride and to safely store their cycles at home, at work and at other destinations. Just this month, we have been speaking to people living in developments built within the last few years and finding examples of families that have bought a car for school journeys because the storage provided with their home was not large enough to fit the cargo bike they wanted to buy. We have to avoid this outcome in future by planning for the city and journeys we want to see and ensuring that all those who would like to cycle have the choice to do so, enabled by the buildings, places and routes they use.

However, Camcycle members who have had previous experience with the planning service (either interacting with it or working for it) have raised concern that too much of the cycle parking text is supporting information rather than policy and thus will not be enforceable. Sentences that include 'must' or 'should' that set standards need to be part of the policy. This applies to points 10.24, 10.25 and 10.26 which are worded in a different way to the rest of the supporting information and should be part of policy with statements like:

- Cycle parking **must** be at least as convenient to access as car parking, accessible for all users, located as close as possible to the main entrance or exit points of buildings, especially where meeting the needs of visitors, and have good lighting and natural surveillance.
- It **must** not be sited where it obstructs pedestrian, wheeling, cycling or vehicle movement.
- Routes to cycle parking **must** be well-maintained and lit, clearly signed, and provide unobstructed, step-free access, avoiding inconvenient detours, steep slopes, narrow paths, or tight turns.
- Cycle parking **must** be secure, with high-quality equipment and materials that provide strong support and enable both the frame and wheels to be locked.
- Spaces **should** be internal, where practicable and appropriate.
- Facilities **must** be inclusive for all users and all types of cycles, avoiding any need to lift, drag, or perform difficult movements to park a cycle.
- Use of two-tier cycle racks **should** be avoided except in areas of high density cycle parking provision such as at mobility hubs and where provided, at least 20% of the overall provision must be in single tier Sheffield stands without racks above.
- Long stay cycle parking **should** be covered.

- The design of cycle parking **should** complement their surroundings, integrate sympathetically into the streetscape, and be clearly identifiable to users with visual impairments.
- In residential developments, cycle parking **should** generally be located in a purpose-built lockable area within or with good access to the front of the house, or within a garage. It may only be located in a rear garden if placing it at the front would conflict with the established character of the surrounding area and if there is no garage available.
- Applicants **should** consider where additional cycle parking may be needed to accommodate visitors, and the most appropriate location for such provision.
- Shared cycle parking **must** have a funded maintenance programme and include provision for monitoring and removing abandoned cycles.

We also note that the statement on residential garages contradicts the policy and guidance given above as an additional 1m at the end of a garage or 650-750mm at the side of a garage will not meet Policy I/CV 1h – the need for cycle parking to accommodate all types of cycles – or Policy I/CV 2b – be easy to access and use.

Please could the shared planning service and existing/future councils with planning responsibility amend Policy I/CV: Cycle and vehicle parking so that the cycle parking statements containing ‘must’ and ‘should’ are enforceable policy which will deliver the safe, accessible and convenient cycle parking needed by our region’s residents.

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport responded:

Would like to thank the public speaker for their contribution and for the helpful feedback Camcycle has provided on the Local Plan so far, which had helped Officers to make a number of improvements to the Plan.

As a strong advocate of active travel, would agree with that we should do everything possible to encourage cycling and have somewhere, secure, accessible, and convenient for bike parking which was often an aspect ignored aspect of it.

During the recent consultation the issue of cycle parking was raised many times. People indicated that the minimum cycle parking requirement should be increased and requested changes to the proposed design criteria, to ensure cycle parking was well located, secure, safe and accessible for all users.

In response to this feedback, several changes were made to the Cycle and Vehicle Parking Policy to ensure the policy was clear, unambiguous and enforceable, drawing all the views put forward. The policy principles are clearly stated accompanied by detailed supporting text to help applicants and Officers understand how well located, secure, accessible cycle parking could be achieved in practice. The Policy doesn't stand alone and should be read alongside other policies in the plan. For example, the People in Place Responsive Design Policy which includes general requirement for inclusive and healthy design and designing out crime. Together they create a strong presumption that good cycling parking would be provided.

Officers have carefully considered all the suggestions put forward by CamCycle and believe the policy in the Proposed Submission plan sets the right principles for cycle parking design, whilst retaining some flexibility on how these are delivered on the ground. This policy needs to work for all applications, no matter how small, large or complex.

Welcomed the suggestion made around management and maintenance plans. The importance of securing the right management and maintenance arrangements have been recognised throughout the Plan, but a specific reference in relation to cycle parking would be a helpful addition to this policy. Subject to the agreement of cabinet would ask officers to address this in the final version.

Supplementary Question

Requested clarification regarding the wording in the supporting information. Could the supporting information be used as part of the planning assessment when considering developments and whether the applicants adhere to it. Would the Planning Committees be able to consider the supporting information alongside the policies when assessing applications.

Secondly, how much scope remained within the Local Plan process for amendments to the wording could be made before the Plan was submitted to Government for examination at the end of the year.

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport said the following:

Had sat on planning committee for eight years and was very much aware that the current Local Plan's supporting information which was often referred to. Would encourage all committee members to become familiar of the supporting information as it underpinned the policies within the Local Plan.

This was an area that would benefit from further discussion. The points that have been raised were clear, and there may be an opportunity to explore them in greater depth.

Would also support bringing the management policy forward for further consideration.

Question 2) Cambridgeshire Sustainable Travel Alliance

The Greater Cambridge Local Plan's vision is that new development must minimise reliance on the private car. The Travel Alliance strongly supports this ambition, which can only be achieved if public transport becomes a realistic option. For many, especially in South Cambs, it isn't currently.

The Local Plan will create new communities at Grange Farm and Cambourne North, where 5100 homes will be built - nearly 40% of the total. The number one alternative to the car for residents in those developments is forecast to be the bus (with train coming a close second in Cambourne North).

Busways are planned for these developments, which will take buses swiftly to the outskirts of Cambridge. For the bus to be a genuine alternative, however, three other ingredients are needed:

- neighbourhood designs that facilitate direct and efficient bus operation (the principles are outlined in Bus Services & New Residential Developments, Second Edition)
- measures to stop buses getting stuck in queuing motor traffic in Cambridge
- frequent services - every 15 mins at peak times on key corridors, with 7 day a week operation and operating hours).

A report presented to the Combined Authority in June forecasts that rather than increasing, more than a third of bus services across Cambs and Peterborough could need to be cut by 2035 (before Cambourne North is built) unless bus operating costs are reduced or more public funding for buses found.

Crucial sections on buses have been added to the policies in this version of the Local Plan - that's an excellent step forward. However, detail is lacking in both the Local Plan and the Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy's delivery programmes on services and bus priority, for example:

- What is the ambition for service frequencies from Cambourne and Grange Farm to Cambridge at peak times?

- What are the bus priority measures envisaged as 'essential infrastructure' (downgraded from strategic infrastructure in the previous version of the local plan)?
- What happens to services to Grange Farm and Cambourne North when S106 funding runs out?

Solutions have also not yet been found to increase public funding for bus services for the long-term

Would the Council Leaders commit to both strengthening the key sections about bus transport in the Local Plan and working with the Combined Authority to strengthen the Delivery Programme in the Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy so that bus transport can be a genuine choice for the residents of new developments set out in the local plan, in particular residents of Cambourne North and Grange Farm?

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport responded with the following:

As the question submitted referred to the new sites in Grange Farm and North Cambridge, the South Cambridgeshire Cabinet Member would provide more detail on the question. Acknowledged that bus provision was of concern to residents in both rural and urban areas but there were additional issues that would be faced by Grange Farm and Cambourne North because of the context of the rural setting to the city.

Reassured the public speaker that securing the highest quality bus services in the city remained a key priority and would continue to work closely with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) as the Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy develops to ensure the strongest possible proposals for future bus provision were developed and submitted later in the year.

Supplementary Question:

Understand that some further modelling was ongoing regarding the transport strategy. Do you have any information about the timing of when that modelling would be available?

The Cabinet Member replied with the following:

Was aware that further modelling was being undertaken but could not provide specific details on the precise time line as this was a programme being led by the CPCA and will be considered at a future CPCA Transport Committee meeting.

Browse meetings - Transport Committee

Cambridge City Council adjourned its Cabinet meeting at 5:49pm.

South Cambridgeshire District Council reconvened its Cabinet meeting at 5:49pm to consider and respond to three public questions, including any supplementary questions under their public speaking scheme

26/48/Cab Greater Cambridge Local Plan: Proposed Submission (Regulation 19) publication

Cambridge City Council reconvened its Cabinet meeting at 6:05pm and Councillor Thornburrow, as Leader and Lead Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport, introduced the report.

The Leader stated the following:

- i. Felt as though they were beginning to reach the end of a very long process, which had started soon after the adoption of the current Local Plan in 2018.
- ii. Believed that reaching this stage with such an outstanding document was a significant achievement and described the document as truly remarkable.
- iii. Noted that local authorities, architects, and planners across the country had been looking to them because of the ambition demonstrated in the emerging Local Plan, which was supported by a strong evidence base.
- iv. Not only was the Plan one of the most ambitious in the country, but that the achievement of two local authorities working collectively across boundaries and party lines, in coalition, to deliver it was particularly noteworthy.
- v. Expressed the Council's thanks to former South Cambridgeshire District Councillor Tumi Hawkins, for all the time and effort they had devoted over the eight years to help bring the process to its current position.
- vi. Reminded members of the meaning of sustainable development, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, which was regularly updated and continued to include this principle. Quoted the objective of sustainable development as being to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
- vii. Often returned to this principle as a reminder of why they were undertaking the work and producing the document.
- viii. Explained that sustainable development encompassed three key objectives: economic, social, and environmental and that equal weight

- had been given to all three objectives throughout the preparation of the document, the development of its policies and the selection of sites.
- ix. Highlighted the economic development objective included not only growth but also innovation and improved productivity and believed that focusing on these areas would help support existing businesses, jobs, and workers across the area.
 - x. Commented on the quality of the planning team, describing them as highly professional, capable and a pleasure to work with and noted they had listened carefully to all stakeholders, including residents, raising issues such as protected parks and cycling provision, as well as businesses, local organisations, developers and councillors.
 - xi. Emphasised that the Local Plan had been shaped by all those who had contributed to the process. When reviewing the amendments made through successive consultations, it was clear that feedback from scrutiny committees, ward councillors and other stakeholders had been carefully considered and incorporated where appropriate.
 - xii. Concluded by expressing gratitude to the shared planning service thanked Officers for their work.

Cambridge City Council adjourned its Cabinet meeting at 6:10pm.

South Cambridgeshire District Council reconvened its Cabinet meeting at 6.10 pm to provide an opportunity for the Leader of South Cambridgeshire District Council, Councillor Smith, and Councillor Batchelor, Lead Cabinet Member for Planning, to introduce the report on behalf of South Cambridgeshire District Council.

South Cambridgeshire District Council adjourned its Cabinet meeting at 6:14pm.

Cambridge City Council reconvened its Cabinet meeting at 6:14pm.

The Leader welcomed the Planning Policy Team. The Planning Policy Manager then delivered a presentation, which was received and noted by both Cabinets and covered the following:

- i. The Greater Cambridge Local Plan had been shaped through several years of work and extensive public consultation. The next stage would be the Regulation 19 consultation, running from 3 August to 25 September, after which responses would be reported back to Members before the plan was submitted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate.

- ii. Around 8,000 representations had been received on the draft plan and have informed the proposed submission version. While the overall growth strategy remained largely unchanged, policies have been refined in response to feedback. The Plan continued to prioritise brownfield development, urban extensions, and new settlements, while limiting additional Green Belt release.
- iii. The plan retained an ambitious approach to climate change, biodiversity, sustainability and active travel, alongside enhanced policies on housing, employment, design, wellbeing, and infrastructure delivery. Further work had strengthened infrastructure planning, particularly in relation to transport and water supply, with ongoing engagement with key partners to support sustainable growth.
- iv. Highlighted issues raised by each local authority's scrutiny committees which included mapping, connectivity, EV charging, parking, transport infrastructure, climate adaptation, and stakeholder engagement. Highlighted that a number of these matters would be addressed through delegated amendments before publication of the Proposed Submission Plan.

In response to question from Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Operations, the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development said the following:

- i. Comments made at the Performance, Assets and Scrutiny Committee meeting ahead of the draft plan consultation last year had been considered by Officers and reflected in the latest Local Plan proposals.

The Leader then requested that Officers consider the management and maintenance arrangements for the shared-use cycle parking, as referenced in the response to the first public speaker.

The Cabinet **unanimously resolved** the recommendation.

Cambridge City Council adjourned its Cabinet meeting at 6:28pm.

South Cambridgeshire District Council reconvened its Cabinet meeting at 6.28 pm. Members were invited to ask questions in relation to the officer presentation, but none were asked.

South Cambridgeshire District Council adjourned its Cabinet meeting at 6:29pm.

Cambridge City Council reconvened its Cabinet meeting at 6:29pm to enable constitutional speaking rights of other speakers.

- i. Noted the comments made by Councillor Young, Chair of the Performance, Assets, and Scrutiny Committee which were as follows:
 - Supported the internalisation of transport within the Cambridge East development, as far as possible, residents could access schools and facilities within the development itself. However, concern was expressed about the impact this approach, and the associated transport links, might have on existing traffic levels in Cambridge.
 - Supported the flexibility built into the Plan, particularly in relation to North East Cambridge and Hartree. If these proposals were to come forward, having a policy framework within the Plan would be welcomed. The proposal could deliver a significant amount of highly sustainable housing in a location close to public transport and Cambridge city centre.
 - Commended the Plan's overall approach to climate change, including its level of ambition and the measures proposed to mitigate overheating and reduce urban heat island effects.
 - Expressed strong support for the proposed 20% biodiversity net gain requirement, particularly the Urban Greening Factor.
 - Commended the introduction of new measures to support neurodiversity in the design of new developments.
 - Welcomed the emphasis on ensuring that infrastructure delivery kept pace with new development and recognised this was a key concern frequently raised by members of the public.
 - Reiterated concerns regarding the transport assumptions underpinning the Plan, particularly those relating to the delivery of a supporting transport strategy by the CPCA.
 - Noted ongoing concerns regarding water scarcity and the implications this may have for future growth and development.

The Leader and Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport responded that the Joint Local Planning Advisory Group had strongly supported retaining the 20% Biodiversity Net Gain requirement and advocated for its continued protection in light of any proposed revisions to the National Planning Policy Framework.

Officers then noted the following comments made by Councillor Bennett, Leader of the Green Group, main opposition party:

- Thanked officers for their diligent work in preparing the Plan despite challenging national circumstances.
- Raised a question about the implications of economic growth on the need for data centres/processing and its consequent implications for water consumption in the area.
- Questioned the proposed deletion of the flexible working policy. Although home working had declined since the pandemic as stated by Officers, it remained at a relatively high level and continued to be particularly important for people with protected characteristics, including disabled people and carers.
- Flexible working also supported business resilience during periods of disruption and could remain important in responding to future public health or other unforeseen events. Therefore, the flexible working policy should remain within the Plan.
- Noted that a number of assumptions had underpinned the plans preparation including around the availability of infrastructure not all of which had yet been delivered.
- Stated that the priority was not necessarily to make incremental improvements to the Plan, but to ensure that its policies would withstand scrutiny by the Planning Inspectorate and that key elements of the Plan would be retained through the examination process.
- Noted the Sustainability Appraisal report had stated the hotels were non-viable, yet two hotel planning applications were currently coming forward in Abbey ward and if an adjustment was required.
- Had received lobbying regarding alternative sites along the A14 and asked how robust the site selection was.
- As responsibility for implementing solutions to address water scarcity rested with Anglian Water and DEFRA, over which the Council has no direct control, how secure was the Plan given its dependence on actions by external bodies.

In response questions and comments raised by Councillor Bennett, the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development and Planning Policy Manager said the following:

- i. The forecast growth of the Cambridge economy presented a number of complex issues, as data and related technologies are a key part of the region's knowledge intensive based economic strength. As growth continues, non-domestic water consumption and the effectiveness of water-saving technologies (including for data processing) would need to be monitored.

- ii. The Council considered a standalone remote working policy unnecessary, as home working and co-working opportunities could already be facilitated through permitted development rights and existing planning policies.
- iii. Hotels were identified as relatively less viable than some other uses, but the evidence did not suggest they were undeliverable or unable to meet policy requirements.
- iv. Following assessment of multiple options for A14 logistics sites, two sites had been selected on the A14 corridor for which had been considered deliverable, justified by evidence of need, and sound.
- v. With regards to water infrastructure: Updated evidence had been prepared with the Government and water industry partners. Development was dependent on the delivery of the necessary water infrastructure.
- vi. No specific allocations are proposed for data centres. Any future proposals would need to comply with the Plan's water efficiency requirements and demonstrate appropriate water management.
- vii. Officers had engaged extensively with the Planning Inspectorate, including discussions with a senior inspector over a two-day period discussing the challenges and robustness of the Plan. Believed the Plan to be robust and evidence-based, although soundness would be determined through examination.

The following comments from Councillor Bick, Leader of the Liberal Democrats were noted:

- Praised the quality of the evidence base, public engagement, and collaborative work behind the Plan.
- Expressed concern that future planning processes may involve less local control despite national commitments to devolution.
- Focused on transport infrastructure and highlighted the importance as a key dependency for delivering the Plan and welcomed the emerging Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy.
- Questioned whether the Combined Authority could be relied upon to deliver necessary transport improvements, noting that its leadership had publicly opposed schemes such as the Cambourne to Cambridge busway and the Cambridge South East Transport project.
- Enquired whether the Council should place greater weight on the transport strategy itself or be concerned about opposition to infrastructure projects that are important to deliver the plan's objectives.

Comments by Councillor Tong were noted:

- Thanked both Officers and Members for their work on the Greater Cambridge Local Plan.

- Welcomed that more was being done to try and regulate and monitor HMOs in the emerging Plan (policy H/MO).
- The Greater Cambridge Local Plan specifically acknowledged that HMOs were often housing for low-income people. Often people were forced to use HMOs due to the lack of social housing.
- Believed there was an uneven distribution of housing types across Cambridge, with social housing concentrated in areas such as Abbey and Arbury, while wards including Castle and Newnham had very limited provision.
- Stated the Council should promote a more balanced mix of housing across the city rather than concentrating particular tenures or housing types in specific areas. Reference was made to Local Plan paragraph 9.97, with concern that the approach to HMOs could reinforce existing patterns of segregation and limit housing options for lower-income residents.
- Declared that Officers had acknowledged no proven correlation between HMOs and antisocial behaviour, yet HMOs had been much singled out for this behaviour.
- Overall, while monitoring of HMOs was supported, a more equitable distribution of such housing across the city was encouraged.

Councillor Porrer, Chair of Planning Committee and Joint Development and Opposition Spokes for Planning was then invited to speak and the following points noted.

- Emphasised that development should be infrastructure-led, with growth only taking place where adequate water and other infrastructure were available.
- Welcomed strengthened policies on data centres, retrofit, carbon reduction and co-living, and supported a robust 20% Biodiversity Net Gain requirement.
- Highlighted the importance of HMOs as part of Cambridge's housing mix and welcomed stronger controls through the Article 4 Direction to improve standards.
- issues sometimes associated with HMOs were often management rather than tenant-related and called for further assessment of the Article 4 Direction's impacts.
- Noted that HMOs were commonly located in sustainable locations where residents are more likely to rely on public transport and less likely to own cars.

Cambridge City Council adjourned its Cabinet meeting at 7:00pm.

South Cambridgeshire District Council reconvened its Cabinet meeting at 7:00pm to invite non-Cabinet Members to address the meeting.

South Cambridgeshire District Council adjourned its Cabinet meeting at 7:14pm.

Cambridge City Council reconvened its Cabinet meeting at 7:14pm to enable Cabinet Members to consider and vote upon the recommendations within the report.

Councillor Moore, Cabinet Member for Climate Action and Environment moved the recommendations. The recommendations were seconded by Councillor Bird, Cabinet Member for Housing.

The Cabinet **unanimously resolved** to:

- a. Agreed the Proposed Submission Greater Cambridge Local Plan (Regulation 19) (Appendix A), and Proposed Submission Policies Map (Appendix B) for Public Consultation;
- b. Noted the Sustainability Appraisal (Appendix C) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (Appendix D) and agreed them as supporting documents that will also be subject to public consultation;
- c. Agreed to the publication of the following supporting documents to the public consultation:
 - i. Statement of Consultation (including summaries of representations received and responses to issues raised) (Appendix E);
 - ii. Duty to Cooperate Statement of Compliance (Appendix F);
 - iii. Draft Duty to Cooperate Statement of Common Ground (Appendix G);
 - iv. Equalities Impact Assessment (Appendix H);
 - v. Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (Appendix I)
 - vi. Topic papers for each theme (Appendix J);
- d. Agreed that any subsequent material amendments to be made to the plan prior to consultation commencing will be approved by the Lead Member for Planning and Transport in Cambridge City Council and Lead Cabinet Member for Planning at South Cambridgeshire District Council;

- e. Agreed that any subsequent minor amendments and editing changes that do not materially affect the content be delegated to the Joint Director of Planning in consultation with the Lead Members for Planning; and
- f. Agreed the Update to the Local Development Scheme (Local Plan Timetable) (Appendix K).

Cambridge City Council adjourned its Cabinet meeting at 7:17pm.

At 7.17pm, South Cambridgeshire District Council's Cabinet reconvened to consider and vote on the recommendations set out in the report.

South Cambridgeshire District Council's Cabinet meeting was then formally closed by Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of the Council at 7:19pm.

Cambridge City Council reconvened its Cabinet meeting at 7:19pm to enable Councillor Katie Thornburrow, Leader and Lead Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport to formally close the meeting at 7:19pm.

The meeting ended at 7.19 pm

CHAIR