

DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE MINUTES

Minutes of a Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Nutholt Lane, Ely on Tuesday 2nd July 2013 at 2:00pm.

P R E S E N T

Councillor Peter Moakes (Chairman)
Councillor Allen Alderson
Councillor David Ambrose Smith
Councillor Colin Fordham
Councillor Sheila Friend-Smith MBE
Councillor Tom Hunt
Councillor Tom Kerby
Councillor Neil Morrison
Councillor Mike Rouse
Councillor Robert Stevens

OTHER ATTENDEES

Councillor Michael Allan
Councillor James Palmer
Councillor Charles Roberts
Shirley Blake – Principal Sustainable Development Officer
Katie Child – Principal Forward Planning Officer
Tony Gryzbek – Principal Accountant
Darren Hill – Business Development Manager
John Hill – Chief Executive
Giles Hughes – Head of Planning & Sustainable Development
Doug Perkins – Economic Development Officer
Adrian Scaites-Stokes – Democratic Services Officer
Jane Thompson - Special Projects Officer
Members of the Public – 3
Representatives of North Ely Developers – 6
Consultants for the Community Land Trusts - 2

17. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The following was received from Parish Councillor Beverley Larner, on behalf of Fordham Parish Council:

1. Page 259 on the Summary of Representations is incorrect. The word “NOT” was omitted from the last sentence of the comment from Malcolm Roper and is a critical omission.
2. The Parish Council have a number of concerns over the way the report has been drafted and its completeness. In places it is misleading and inaccurate.

3. Firstly there is no reference to our total dissatisfaction with the consultation process, the way the District Council has responded to our comments and the decision making process.
4. Secondly we are unhappy with the fact that at no point is mention made of the fact that the Parish Council was originally asked to identify just **one** more site. In their report to Committee on 3 July 2012 officers wrote that Site FRD1 scored more highly than FRD3 that in their view had: *'The potential for adverse visual impact as the site is currently a large field in an open location. Would alter the character of this gap are [sic]. Further from the main built-up part of Fordham.'* This is not reflected in the Schedule in the Appendix and we have little faith in the adequacy and therefore value of the Sustainability Appraisal assessment.
5. The Parish Council has made a number of representations to the Committee about the inclusion of FRD3 and they still do not understand the rational for including FRD3 as there has never been an officers' committee report setting out why it should be included and the reason behind members' decision has never been explained. The Parish Council believes its inclusion is a serious error of judgement. We are also at a loss to understand why a Councillor who is not connected to Fordham has been able to be heard by the Committee on behalf of FRD3 (for reasons we do not understand because they have never been explained to us) and yet the said Councillor has never attended or communicated with the Parish Council.
6. The ECDC response in Appendix 1 is therefore seriously misleading and should be amended to reflect what was said in the 3 July committee report and reflect the grounds of the Parish Councils opposition to its inclusion and the results of the most recent survey. Only one person supported the inclusion of FRD3 and that was the landowner, everyone else objected. This was not mentioned.
7. Further to a recent meeting of Parish Councillors with officers we had an understanding that there would be a fuller explanation of the disadvantages of FRD3 in the committee report. This has not happened and arguably the opposite has happened.
8. We would wish to be re-assured that the material sent to the Planning Inspector in the supporting evidence will include **all** past Committee reports and minutes plus the representations the Parish Council has made, so that the Inspector has full information on the decision making process.
9. Finally, in the Report to Committee, page 2 Arguments/conclusions, item 4.3. Has ECDC not taken into account that the whole questionnaire was far too complicated and the instructions complex to the extreme? I complained about this at the time of my own submission. I can find no reference in the papers to my comments? I would like to know how a low response to an over-complicated questionnaire be seen as a positive factor?

The Chairman stated that these issues would come under discussion under agenda item number 9, but that a written response would be given later.

The following was submitted from Paul Sutton, on behalf of David Wilson Homes Ltd:

In the light of the latest housing figures set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), which identifies a need for at least 11,500 new dwellings in

the East Cambridgeshire District for the period 2011 to 2031, the Council's draft Local Plan clearly needs to identify further housing sites for at least another 1,500 dwellings – otherwise, it runs the risk that the Local Plan will be rejected as being 'unsound'.

The SHMA forms a key evidence base document that has been produced in response to the 'duty to cooperate' set out in the Localism Act and the Council must give serious consideration to the conclusions on housing need.

The officer's report suggests that 'phase 2' sites from both the Soham and Littleport Masterplans can be recognised to bring sites forward in the later part of the Plan period to help meet this need. In addition, it is also suggested that the Council commit to a review of the Local Plan within two years.

However, given the total number of dwellings that now need to be provided over the Plan period, the Council should also reconsider the ability of potential housing sites in Burwell to meet the need and to ensure that a suitable range of available and deliverable housing sites are included.

David Wilson Homes' suggested concept for Burwell would provide a more evenly distributed spread of new residential development around the village in a much more sustainable arrangement. This would also have less visual impact on the surrounding countryside than one very large development to the north of Newmarket Road.

A recent public consultation carried out in Burwell by David Wilson Homes – in respect of the land west of Ness Road – shows that nearly half of local residents (49%) who submitted their feedback felt that David Wilson Homes' suggestions for the Burwell Village Vision were helpful additions to the Masterplan, whereas only 26% disagreed. Furthermore, a clear majority (60%) agreed with the proposals to provide a roundabout feature at the Ness Road entrance to the village.

In the light of this supportive feedback from local residents, we would request that the Council includes this site as a potential housing allocation within the draft Local Plan.

The Chairman stated that the Council had undertaken extensive public consultation in Burwell and the clear message was that all the new housing should be on the identified Newmarket Road site and there was no appetite for other sites. So this suggestion would not be taken up. A full written response would be sent later.

18. **APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

Apologies were received from Councillor David Brown.

19. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

20. **MINUTES**

It was resolved:

That the minutes of the meeting held 11th June 2013 be confirmed as a correct record and be signed by the Chairman.

21. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman made the following announcements:

As Chairman of the Committee I have agreed to take an urgent item relating to a grant application for the Swaffham Prior Community Land Trust. Consideration of this item at this meeting will enable the Community Land Trust to be formally established and for it to prepare a planning application for the autumn. Delaying consideration of this issue until the next Development and Transport meeting would not allow this to happen. The report has been circulated to Members before the meeting and I propose to take this item after agenda item 6.

Councillor James Palmer joined the meeting at this point, 2:18pm.

East Cambridgeshire District Council has been awarded £379,500 from the Department of Communities and Local Government under their Local Infrastructure Fund Scheme for planning/ capacity support to help to deliver the North Ely Urban extension. The economic development team submitted the bid with the support of the developers/promoters of the scheme and the large applications team at the Homes and Communities Agency (ATLAS). The funding will be used for a variety of uses including key studies and staff resource to help accelerate delivery of the scheme.

22. **EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL – COMMUNITY LAND TRUST PRE-DEVELOPMENT LOAN (STRETHAM & WILBURTON CLT)**

The Committee considered a report, reference N36, previously circulated, about a pre-development loan application from Stretham and Wilburton Community Land Trust (CLT).

The Chief Executive advised the Committee that the Minister for Housing had praised the work of this Council on Community Land Trusts, something it was leading the country in. The Council was committed to establishing more CLTs and this had been included in Local Plan policies. This programme aimed to support CLTs at various stages including helping fund preparation of planning applications. The Committee was asked to approve the proposed loan criteria and the specific loan application from the Stretham and Wilburton CLT.

The Chief Executive introduced Philip Rose who advised the Committee that the Stretham and Wilburton CLT had community support, was commercially viable and now had assets to manage. The CLT had been formed in October 2012 and was established using national CLT funding with local support. The most suitable sites for development had been identified, with Manor Farm preferred, heads of terms had

been secured as had a grant from the Design Council. A development brief had been drawn up which appeared to have broad community support and there was a proposal to put legal terms in place. Funding would be needed to enable the CLT to spend on legal fees and planning fees to take the project forward for planning consent. The total costs were estimated at around £90k, £60k of which had been secured from the CLT national fund. This left a gap of £30k.

It was expected that the planning application would include affordable housing, a new building for General Practitioners, small business units, a large public open space and a cemetery. If the planning application were approved the site would go forward for evaluation. 40% of the uplift in the land value would go back to the CLT, as it wanted to move to the acquisition of valuable physical assets to help re-pay the loans.

In response to Councillor Peter Moakes' query, it was revealed that when the CLT put forward the plan for the site it could be financed via banks or other financiers.

Councillor Tom Kerby would like to see the cash flow and business plans in full, as the Council needed this information before spending public money.

Councillor Mike Rouse thought the scheme was a good one and would give community benefits and so should be backed. The Committee, however, did need some re-assurance as this was a new area. Going through this process helped build up knowledge and experience which would help with other schemes that were coming up.

Councillor James Palmer said that usually the Committee would look at policies elsewhere to help with its decision, but this issue was brand-new. It was hoped that the Committee would back this scheme, as it was good to be the first council to do this. The scheme was right for Stretham and Wilburton and also for the district.

The report recommendations were proposed, seconded, and when put to the vote the proposals were carried.

It was resolved:

- (i) That the lending criteria and requirements for supporting documentation detailed in Appendix 1 be approved;
- (ii) That the loan application from Stretham and Wilburton Community Land Trust for £30,000 be approved.

23. **URGENT ITEM - COMMUNITY LAND TRUST (CLT) SET-UP GRANT APPLICATION (SWAFFHAM PRIOR CLT)**

The Committee considered an urgent item, reference N48, previously circulated, relating to a CLT set-up grant application from the emerging Swaffham Prior Community Land Trust. They had applied for a grant to be used to engage solicitors to establish the CLT formally with an associated constitution, policies and preparation of a lease with the preferred housing association. An urgent item was needed to allow Members to consider the grant application (and if successful) enable the CLT to

submit a planning application in the Autumn. The next Development and Transport Committee meeting in September would not allow the CLT and Parish Council to meet this timetable.

The Chief Executive advised the Committee that an application from Swaffham Prior CLT had been received for the first stage of the CLT process, as it needed assistance.

The Chief Executive introduced Debbie Wildridge, who advised the Committee about the application for funding to help set up the CLT for Swaffham Prior. The Steering Group did not have any funds but needed to cover legal costs. The area identified had been included in the Council's Local Plan, which should deliver 22 dwellings including 8 affordable houses. 13 of those homes would be targeted at households within Swaffham Prior or for people with a connection to it. The landowner wanted the freehold given to the community. It was planned to use a housing association and a developer to deliver the scheme, with the backing of the Parish Council, who would receive the funding while the CLT was set up.

Councillor Robert Stevens noted that this scheme was different to the other CLT and suggested the houses could be sold with the profit going to the developers, or would they be rented by the community? Affordable housing was not normally given to local people as a priority but, under a Section 106 agreement, this could be achieved. It would also be more appropriate to consider people from Reach or Lode rather than Burwell.

The Committee was informed that the housing association would get the rents but would lease the land from the CLT. It would be a long lease so the CLT would be able to keep the affordable housing properties for the community. It was possible to use a Section 106 agreement to set local allocations.

It was resolved:

That the grant application from Swaffham Prior CLT for £4,700 be approved.

24. **NORTH ELY JOINT STRATEGIC MASTERPLAN**

The Committee considered a report, reference N37, previously circulated, which outlined the progress in preparing a Joint Strategic Masterplan for the North Ely Development.

The Representatives of the North Ely Developers introduced themselves: Paula Cuthbertson, Ben Hooton, Paul Lishman, Joanna Loxton, Ian Smith and Paul Smith. A presentation was given and the following comments were made:

- There was a long history to the site and its progress towards its Masterplan.
- This started with the Council debating future growth, then proposing the development of north Ely, developing a framework for around 3000 dwellings, going out to public consultation and looking for endorsement from the Committee.
- The landowners had produced a Masterplan which updated the Council framework with more detail.
- The details had been updated to reflect the understanding of the site.

- The North Ely Masterplan set out the key priorities, covering the housing, link road, local centres and site layout.
- The topography of the site and its green links had been considered when drawing up the emerging structure. The site would deliver 50% green infrastructure.
- Locations and potential users had been considered when contemplating community uses, so 2 centres had been proposed, on Lynn Road and near Cam Drive.
- A primary school, shops and services, a community building, a work hub and a community/worship hall were all proposed.
- This would be delivered by the two landowners working closely alongside the Council with an agreed approach.
- The next step would be for the Council to produce a Supplementary Planning Document based on the strategic Masterplan.

Councillor Mike Rouse thought it was vitally important to deliver infrastructure right across the site, as the mistakes of the past had to be avoided. Previously land elsewhere had been divided between developers meaning that the links between them had not been completed. The Council had worked very hard to rectify the problems this caused so it was good to see a scheme in place that would deliver this for this site. A country park should be delivered as part of the scheme with links into cycleways and pathways. The site should also provide a good interface between urban Ely and the countryside, to bridge that gap. It was also important to provide some employment in this area, although it had to be borne in mind that working habits would change over the next 20 years.

Councillor Sheila Friend-Smith echoed the views expressed concerning a coordinated approach, but thought there would be a need for someone to oversee the scheme. Buses would presumably go through the new housing development, but this could be a problem if people parked on the roads restricting access, as had happened elsewhere in Ely.

Councillor Allen Alderson wanted a commitment to some self-build housing to avoid an 'identikit' development. This would be advantageous for Ely and the people involved, as it would make the houses affordable. There was some concern though, that this type of housing would not be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy contributions.

Councillor Neil Morrison queried why, since the last viewing of the proposed development, that the idea of retail provision had been downgraded to an one-stop shop. The locality would need more than that. As the Council had recently secured funding to provide wheelie bins, had any thought been given to its provision on this development? The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development stated that this would need looking at when the detailed designs were being considered.

Councillor Robert Stevens questioned the environmental sustainability of the development, considering all houses built after 2016 had to be carbon neutral. This would put constraints on house orientation and other design. Was this being taken into account at this point? The Committee was advised that this was a national

problem but provided there was the space this could be accommodated. The Committee was reminded that 2016 was only a target date and was not legislation.

Councillor David Ambrose Smith asked whether the views of the internal drainage boards were being heeded, as in their view it appeared not. The Committee was informed that letters had been received from the drainage boards stating their agreement to the scheme.

Councillor Colin Fordham was worried about the use of concrete parking bays rather than provision of garages. It was revealed that some housing would include garages and the target was for 100% off-street parking.

It was resolved:

That the presentation be received.

25. **FEN ADVENTURERS RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME**

The Committee considered a report, reference N38, previously circulated, about provision of financial support to enable a continuation of the Fen Adventurers Rural Development Programme in the transition period between the closure of the current European Union funding programme and the commencement of the new programme in 2015.

The Principal Sustainable Development Officer advised the Committee that the Development Programme had been funded via the European Union, with the Council as partners, to attract funding into the area. The funding was used for the agricultural and tourism industries and £695K had been received in grants resulting in the creation of 46 jobs. However, the European funding was coming to a close, although a new programme was expected from 2015. In the meantime it was proposed to keep the team together to continue the work in the interim but this would require some funding. The latest indication was that possibly only £3K would be needed to do this, so the recommendation was changed for a grant up to £5K.

Councillor Neil Morrison thought obtaining £695K from a contribution of £25K was an excellent return and gave a good reason to continue funding.

Councillor Mike Rouse thought it was tough for agricultural businesses at the moment without investment and spreading good practice, so this proposal should be supported.

It was resolved:

That a grant of up to £5,000 be given to support the Fens Adventurer Rural Development Programme during their 2014 transitional year.

26. **EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN – SUBMISSION DRAFT AND RESPONSES**

The Committee considered a report, reference N39, previously circulated, which detailed the consultation responses to the draft East Cambridgeshire Local Plan (pre-submission draft) published for consultation in February/March 2013.

The Principal Forward Planning Officer advised the Committee that only 494 people responded to the consultation, but this was because many more had been involved in the Village Vision work and it indicated people's acceptance of the draft Plan. At this stage in the process only minor changes could be submitted. A further document with amendments to the minor modifications, 'Amendments to the Schedule of Proposed Minor Modifications', was tabled. Any major changes would require a re-consultation.

Three parish councils had suggested significant changes. Both Fordham and Isleham Parish Councils did not agree with particular allocations within their parishes, whereas Sutton Parish Council had changed its previously consistent position and had proposition a further allocation. The suggested review of the Plan could re-consider the Fordham and Isleham allocations, as they had been included, but not the Sutton one as it was a new suggestion.

The work looking at the housing requirements for the sub-region had now been completed, as reflected in Appendices 3 and 4 with a new Chapter 12 of the Strategic Market Housing Assessment and Memorandum of Co-Operation. The Memorandum had increased the target of housing in the district by an additional 1500, but this had not been included in the current Plan. This would be dealt with via the review in 2-years time or via the phase 2 developments in Littleport or Soham.

Councillor Neil Morrison asked on what the basis the extra 1500 houses had been added. It was revealed that various forecasting models had been used, based on the growth trend over the past 8 to 10 years. As East Cambridgeshire had seen inflated growth previously this had affected the figures. Originally 3000 extra houses had been suggested but the Council had co-operated with its neighbouring councils to reach a better agreement.

Councillor Mike Rouse noted that many villages did not want growth but had already had land available with planning permission that had not been built on. With the continued growth in population it was to be expected that larger settlements would have to take the extra housing. A large number of comments had been received from Wicken so how was this being dealt with? The Principal Forward Planning Officer explained that the views expressed were not that of the larger community nor the local parish council. This issue could be revisited during the 2-year review.

Councillor Michael Allan, in speaking for Fordham Parish Council, stated that the Parish Council did not think its views were being taken into consideration. The particular site it thought should be excluded was huge and could potentially accommodate over 100 houses. The Parish Council agreed with the other two sites suggested but not this third one.

The Chairman pointed out that the Committee had considered this issue in great detail over a number of meetings. The site in question had not been allocated in its entirety but only a small portion of it, to take 10 houses. Fordham already had 140 plots allocated previously, which had not been taken up, so this was in addition to that allocation. All the points about this site had been heard.

Councillor Mike Rouse stated that the Committee had a role in deciding this issue and, although it was extremely important that the views of the parish councils be given serious consideration, the Committee had to take the district view into account. The Committee had attempted to be even-handed and fair in making its decision and there was no reason to change it.

It was resolved:

- (i) That the consultation responses received on the draft Local Plan and officer responses/recommendations (attached as Appendix 1 to this report) be noted;
- (ii) That the specific requests received from Isleham, Fordham and Sutton Parish Councils, for significant alterations to the relevant draft Village Visions (as detailed in paragraph 4.7 of the report and Appendix 1) be noted but no changes to the draft Local Plan be made;
- (iii) That the submission to Government of the 'Schedule of Proposed Minor Modifications' (attached as Appendix 2) and the tabled 'Amendments to the Schedule of Proposed Minor Modifications' alongside the draft Local Plan be endorsed;

It was resolved TO RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL:

- (iv) That the pre-submission draft Local Plan (as published in February 2013) and any necessary accompanying evidence be submitted to Government as soon as feasible and that subsequent minor changes to the Schedule of Proposed Minor Modifications prior to submission be delegated to the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman of this Committee;

It was further resolved:

- (v) That the new Chapter 12 of the Strategic Market Housing Assessment (attached as Appendix 3) be noted;
- (vi) That the draft Memorandum of Cooperation between Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (attached as Appendix 4) be endorsed;

It was further resolved TO RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL:

- (vii) That the revised Local Development Scheme (attached as Appendix 5) be approved and adopted by the District Council.

27. **GREATER CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND GREATER PETERBOROUGH LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP**

The Committee considered a report, reference N40, previously circulated, concerning the Greater Cambridgeshire and Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership's (GCGP LEP) Operational Plan 2013/14.

The Business Development Manager presented the operational plan for the forthcoming year, which outlined how the LEP would work, its resources and financing. Its key priorities related to the Alconbury Enterprise Zone, transport infrastructure, skills provision, international promotion and investment. Many of this Council's priorities fitted in with these. The LEP would receive additional resources with a single pot available to help produce a local growth strategy. It would also be given priority for European funding. This would give some opportunities to gain additional funding for the Council. Currently the Council was a Corporate Member and the subscription for next year was expected to be £17,000. This was an increase but everyone else's contribute was also increasing.

The local growth strategy would be given £16K from the Growing Places Fund, the majority of which would be loans. The LEP appeared to be moving away from infrastructure projects towards economic growth projects.

Councillor Tom Kerby thought the Council had to talk to the LEP and be more proactive to get the Council's projects into the growth strategy. Hopefully the Council could get more out of this than it put in.

Councillor Mike Rouse was concerned about the horticultural and agricultural industries and wanted the LEP to help get apprentices into these industries. The Council had to push for help to create jobs.

Councillor Allen Alderson queried the funding for the A14 improvements, as the LEP was due to contribute £50million with the Council providing £1million. Councillor Peter Moakes explained that the Government had made an announcement about the A14 but the local authorities including the LEP would be expected to contribute. The Council's contribution would over 25 years.

It was resolved:

That the contents of the GCGP LEP Operational Plan 2013/14 be noted.

28. **TOWN CENTRE WORKING PARTY RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Committee considered a report, reference N41, previously circulated, detailing the recommendations of the Town Centres Working Party.

The Economic Development Officer reminded the Committee that the Working Party was set up after the Portas Review and had gone through evidence, met town centre teams and visited a 'best practice' location. The issues of town centres was well known but there were fantastic opportunities to aid town centres.

The recommendations covered 4 main themes – improving communication between the Council and retailers and landlords; instigating best practice to support local business; expand the town centre team to cover Soham and Littleport; draw up a strategic growth plan. The role of the Working Party over the next 12 months would be to have a strategic overview and to support the town teams.

Councillor Tom Kerby, Chairman of the Working Party, stated that it had been a steep learning curve but they were starting to nail down what needed to be achieved. Lack of communication between the Council and retailers and landlords was a key issue and work to build relationships had started. One of the ideas raised by the landlords was to change the drop-off point for coaches to the other side of the city centre away from the cathedral to help increase footfall. Wider issues also needed looking at.

Councillor Tom Hunt accepted that the Council had to do more to help the town centres but the trades should be encouraged to do more too, as this was a two-way process. The future of the town centres was critical so serious thought had to be given to get better and bigger shops, integrating them with the existing ones. The best that the centres had should be kept but other changes should be made.

Councillor David Ambrose Smith applauded the recommendations but thought the requested sum should be increased. He therefore proposed that the recommendation (ii) should read 'up to £20K' and this was agreed.

Councillor Sheila Friend-Smith felt that the way to help the economy of the city centre was through events such as the Ely Flower Festival, as this produced an amazing level of footfall. A lot had been learnt from the Soham traders but the Ely traders had not been as good at getting together. The Ely Market Place upgrade study had stalled as the building owners had not co-operated. There were some empty shops that would be ideal for young people's clothes shops.

Councillor Mike Rouse said that they were co-operating up to a point, as they were not prepared to use the Council's architects. They were looking at the Market Place and were committed to working with the Council. Ideas for Ely Market Place were needed to improve the space for holding civic events. There was a lot going for the farmers' markets but the area needed to be pulled together. Some other ideas should be coming forward. The Cathedral was also interested in working with others, as it had a number of shops along the High Street, so it was in their interests to increase footfall.

Councillor Robert Stevens reminded the Committee that Ely had a lot of visitors to the Cathedral, Oliver Cromwell's House and the Museum but there was nothing to draw them across the town. The Flower Festival had helped the city as the visitors had also been around the shops. Unfortunately the shops in the villages were not faring so well, so the Council needed to look at ways to at least retain the shops already in existence.

Councillor Neil Morrison revealed that a business plan for Littleport had been completed a few years ago but was adequate enough to be cascaded to other locations, without the need to hire expensive retail consultants.

It was resolved:

- (i) That the recommendations set out in section 4 of the report be approved where there is no budget/significant resource commitment;
- (ii) That a bid for funding through the next budget round for some or all of those recommendations in section 4 of the report be resolved where funding support is required to progress the work, up to £20,000;
- (iii) That the terms of reference and remit of the Working Party for the next 12 months be approved.

29. **COMMITTEE FINANCIAL OUTTURN REPORT 2012/13**

The Committee considered a report, reference N42, previously circulated, which updated on the Committee's provisional outturn position for 2012/13 for both revenue and capital expenditure.

The Principal Accountant advised the Committee that the Statement of Accounts was currently being audited. Over the last year there had been an underspend of £850K, but taking the accounting processes into consideration this showed an overspend of £10K.

Councillor Neil Morrison noted the overspend on St Marys Street Car Park and the Committee was informed that this related to an asset management issue,

Councillor Robert Stevens queried the underspend on street naming and numbering and wondered whether this was shown in the accounts. The Principal Accountant stated that this was accounted for, based on the information provided by the staff.

It was resolved:

That the provisional outturn under spend across the Committee's Services of £851,049 be noted. However, when funding to and from Earmarked Reserves and year-end capital entries are taken in account, the true provisional outturn is an over spend of £10,595 (see Appendix 2).

The meeting concluded at 5:08pm.