

## **DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE MINUTES**

Minutes of a Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Nutholt Lane, Ely on Monday 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2012 at 2:00pm.

### **P R E S E N T**

Councillor Peter Moakes (Chairman)  
Councillor Allen Alderson  
Councillor David Ambrose Smith  
Councillor Kevin Ellis  
Councillor Colin Fordham  
Councillor Tony Goodge  
Councillor Tom Kerby  
Councillor Neil Morrison  
Councillor Mike Rouse  
Councillor Robert Stevens  
Councillor Gareth Wilson (as Substitute for Councillor Sheila Friend-Smith MBE)

### **OTHER ATTENDEES**

Councillor Michael Allan  
Councillor Anna Bailey  
Councillor Derrick Beckett  
Councillor Elaine Griffin-Singh  
Councillor James Palmer  
Councillor Hazel Williams MBE  
Katie Child – Principal Forward Planning Officer  
Darren Dixon – Head of Community Services  
Tracey Harding - Team Leader Tourism & Town Centre Services  
Jane Hollingworth – Head of Housing  
Giles Hughes – Head of Planning & Sustainable Development  
Adrian Scaites-Stokes – Democratic Services Officer  
Members of the Public - 7

#### 87. **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

Mr Moffatt submitted the following statement:

My name is Stewart Moffatt, Fordham Resident and I hold a vested interest as owner of Site 11 in the Fordham Village Vision.

After 6<sup>th</sup> November meeting of this committee a meeting was kindly arranged through Councillor Moakes and Councillor Kerby on 29<sup>th</sup> November and was attended by Councillor Kerby, Mr Hughes and Ms Child and myself.

We learned from Ms Child at that meeting that the owner of Site 16 (37-55 Mildenhall Road) was asked if he wanted to develop his land prior to the consultation and declined. At some later point post consultation he changed his mind and Ms Child then allowed Site 16 to be inserted into the planning process and as reported in Fordham Parish Council Minutes 29<sup>th</sup> Aug she sought and succeeded in influencing the view of the Parish Council in its favour.

By permitting Site 16 to be parachuted in post consultation it has disrupted the system and clouded what ought to be a very transparent and open process, this can only cast aspersions as to the probity of its purpose.

We also learned from the meeting that none of the 45 other villages in East Cambs Local Plan had a site imposed in this manner and certainly none that displaced completely the community's choice. It is no coincidence that all 45 other villages appear to be proceeding smoothly through the process.

The result of 29<sup>th</sup> Nov meeting was Mr Hughes is now of the view that the Fordham Consultation should be run again. Mr Hughes has also stated that this new consultation would be bound by the result of the public vote therefore overrule any technical objection.

I do not agree with this. However flawed the first consultation was it clearly reflected the views of the community and the result of the village vote is unambiguous, the only confusion outstanding is the inclusion of Site 16.

A cornerstone of Mr Hughes view towards a new consultation is that S16 was not voted on. That is absolutely correct, the landowner decided he didn't want to submit it to consultation. His other point, over the selection of Site 8, had been already investigated by the Head of Legal Standards (complaint CC01/12) and the decision was that no further action should be taken.

As we were told on numerous occasions by the planning team on Thursday three considerations must be satisfied, the technical viewpoint, the Parish Council's viewpoint and the community view. Technical – no objection in forthcoming vote how can there be a valid technical objection currently to Site 11, the land has not changed. Community – clearly in favour of Site 11 (84% of the vote). Parish – Site 11 was a referred choice of the Parish Council consultation until influenced otherwise by the Planning Dept.

The only declared objection to Site 11 from the planning department was it "read very much like open countryside". This objection can be waived apparently in the new consultation.

How is it that since July all my objections to S16 and the failure to support the community choice could be explained away by the experts but now seems that when there is a mechanism that S16 can be properly introduced within the consultation all those objections seem to have disappeared? The vote was already been run the winner was Site 11! A new vote should not take place because vested interests will not allow a fair vote. Apathy in the village towards another consultation (after the results of the previous have been ignored) will guarantee disinterest and a lower turnout. The Cricket

Club and its members will vote for site 8 a new pavilion. The village will not get what it wants it will get a new cricket pavilion. The Parish Council have already been influenced by the Planning Department into changing its view over Site 11. Suspicion as to the purpose of a new vote is inevitable.

This new consultation being suggested sets a dangerous precedent in that it is coming exclusively because a landowner has changed his mind. He had the same opportunity prior to consultation as all others to have his land considered by the community, he declined to take part. What will happen if on seeing the new consultation the owner of Site 9 or 10 changes their mind? Will that provoke another insertion of site into the process or is Site 16 somehow particularly special? Exceptions should not be made.

The consultation train left the station on 21 May 2012 and Site 16 was not on board. The Chairman's observation of the 6<sup>th</sup> Nov D&T meeting was met with agreement that the review points should be inserted into the 20 year plan, such that in the future if circumstances dictate changes then can be made. Surely that is the correct opportunity for S16 to be introduced, properly and openly and without further costs to the taxpayer.

Interesting to note that the new consultation "won't cost very much". I'm sure they are right, after all as a result of a Freedom of Information request the original consultation for Fordham only cost £37 over and above normal office costs. There seems to be a very cavalier attitude to spending taxpayers money. Now the planning office appears to have no serious objections to S11, the Parish Council will have their way and the community will get the site they voted for. I understand that the process of consultation is a new one and to succeed lessons must be learned for future from these events. A danger of repeating the consultation is that it cannot maintain credibility when it is manipulated in this way and repeated until the right answer is achieved. The consultative process cannot be repeated simply because a landowner has changed their mind, otherwise it will never end. The consultation process should be clear and transparent. Defined limits should be laid down and adhered to. The limits of influence of both the public vote and the planning dept should be made clear to all concerned. More care should be taken in the initial presentation, i.e. how many sites should be determined before misunderstandings arise.

I would respectfully request that now the technical objections to S11 seem to have evaporated the result of the consultation Vision for Fordham is implemented. Site 16 should be removed from the process and replaced by the community's choice Site 11 and that no further tax revenue be spent trying to achieve the right answer.

The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development stated that this issue would be picked up later in the meeting. 3 hours had been spent talking to Mr Moffatt about the issues. The Parish Council had an initial clear view on this matter and it did not support Site 11. The suggestions that it had been influenced by this Council was not a view shared by officers. The original consultation had been at the start of the process and Site 16 had not been included but should be now. Issues were moving forward to help understand the community view and officers did not support Mr Moffatt's view. A further consultation could be held targeting Mildenhall Road residents only.

88. **APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

Apologies were received from Councillor Sheila Friend-Smith MBE. Councillor Gareth Wilson substituted for her for this meeting.

89. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were of no declarations of interest made.

90. **MINUTES**

Councillor Neil Morrison suggested that the on page 7, after the words “so it should be” the word “open” should be replaced with the word “offered”. This amendment was agreed.

Councillor Robert Stevens queried the timing of Councillor Alderson’s arrival as recorded in the minutes, i.e. 3:36pm<sup>1</sup>. The Democratic Services Officer agreed to check back on his notes for the meeting.

It was resolved:

That the minutes of the meeting held 6<sup>th</sup> November 2012, as amended, be confirmed as a correct record and be signed by the Chairman.

91. **CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no chairman’s announcements.

92. **CAR PARKING IN ELY**

The Committee considered a report, reference M142, previously circulated, which set out a joint proposal from the City of Ely Council and District Council for car parking Ely.

The Head of Community Services reminded the Committee that it had considered this issue back in March and had wanted a further review including consultation with the City of Ely Council. Revised proposals had been drawn up between the two councils and had taken account of the impact on the town centre, low paid workers and the requirements to facilitate high turnover. Currently parking was paid for by some East Cambridgeshire residents who did not use those facilities. With predicted increases in population growth, it was anticipated that the 20% increase would result in an additional 800 parking actions per day.

The proposals for charging included for 1 hour free parking and this would mean an estimated 2000 people per day would not be affected by charging. The level of charges proposed compared favourably with other nearby locations. No increases in charging could be implemented until May 2015. The budget projections had been based on a cost neutral scheme, though

---

<sup>1</sup> Subsequent to the meeting, on checking back it was found that the time should have read 2:36pm.

there were provisions to allow any additional income to be used to re-invest in projects to benefit the town centre. Any remaining funds could be used to reduce the level of charging or increase parking capacity, including the use of a park-and-ride service.

The County Council had given a commitment to review Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) during the next financial year. In the meantime a dialogue would be opened up with the Police to increase enforcement.

The issue had been considered by the Scrutiny Committee on 27<sup>th</sup> November and it had made three recommendations, which were tabled.

If the proposals were agreed then a 12 week consultation would be undertaken with an intended implementation date of 1<sup>st</sup> July 2013. The draft Car Parking Order 2013 would form the main part of the consultation. It was based on the existing Order and integrated the new proposals.

Councillor Neil Morrison complained that not all the papers had been supplied to Scrutiny Committee. Referring to page 16 of the report, he queried whether it was Column 6 in Schedule 2 of the Order for the Initial Charge. This was confirmed.

*Councillor Derrick Beckett joined the meeting at this point, 2:25pm.*

Councillor Morrison continued and asked why the car park in Hempfield Road in Littleport was not included. The Team Leader Tourism & Town Centre Services explained that it was not covered by the Order but was unsure why, so would look into the matter.

Councillor Robert Stevens questioned the problems that were being caused because of the early morning restrictions in the long-stay car parks. A lot of the restrictions on long-term use were unnecessary. The Head of Community Services thought adding different buttons for different options on the ticket machines, to address these problems, would cause confusion for the users, due in part to the complexities of the machines. People parking early would still have to obtain a ticket.

Councillor Allen Alderson asked if disabled users would be allowed an extra 2 hours free parking and how that would work. The Committee was informed that this had been worked through the Access Group and the recommendation was that they be provided with this extra time. Those users would have to use designated parking bays displaying their blue badges so they would be allowed the extra hours free parking. Councillor Colin Fordham asked about the number of disabled bays and where they were located. The Head of Community Services explained that the number of bays per car park was set down in statute and had been reviewed.

Councillor Hazel Williams questioned the relationship between this Committee and the Scrutiny Committee. The Scrutiny Committee had been held too close to this meeting and the discussions held had not been considered, so this item was being taken in isolation. With regard to on-street parking, the County Council would be looking at it next year but this would result in chaos. Nobody had a right to a highway parking space so what had happened in Newmarket,

where people parked on the streets instead, would happen here. The city would also have three free car parks at the supermarkets, plus another possible one to come. The whole car parking issue could not be looked at in its entirety without involving those car parks. Although not objecting to charging, chaos could be expected if on-street parking was free. If on-street charging was not introduced at the same time then it was a recipe for chaos.

Councillor Allen Alderson reminded the Committee that when car parking charges were first introduced in Newmarket they were not popular. However, current feedback showed there was now very little ill feeling about it. So in time people would get used to charging. Currently the car parks were costing every taxpayer in the district but tourists got it for free. Although money was tight the Council still had to maintain services and undertake statutory duties.

Councillor Mike Rouse gave thanks to the City of Ely Council which had been responsible for a more reasonable scheme being proposed. However he was opposed to charges, particularly during this time of recession. It would be unfair on taxpayers to provide this in Ely, as Ely people would not provide for parking in Burwell, Littleport or Soham. It was not a comprehensive package and would result in a serious issue of displacement parking, which was already an inconvenience to residents. There would be no control over dangerous or inconsiderate parking on the streets and the scheme would not apply to the supermarket car parks. The charges would impact on residents of outlying villages, which had few services. The worth of the proposed scheme had to be questioned if it were to be cost neutral with the town centre struggling. The new leisure centre could help provide a park-and-ride scheme to ease the parking problems. Why was there a rush to introduce the scheme? The scheme should be shelved until the impacts were known and should await the consultation results.

Councillor Robert Stevens thought the proposals were modest, although there were some strange issues over ticketing arrangements. Non-car drivers were currently paying for the car parks when they should not. It was also not the job of the District Council to subsidise businesses. There would be problems with on-street parking as a result but the County Council would be left to pick that problem up, though it was not expected that it would deal with this quickly. It was important that this Council, the County Council and the City of Ely Council anticipated what could happen and pro-actively work to have things in place to deal with it.

Councillor Tony Goodge reminded the Committee that cars were already parking on-street so the introduction of charging would not cause a major impact. CPE was now back on the agenda so it could be expected in the future. In the meantime, more enforcement was needed by the Police. The charges would hopefully encourage car-sharing, which would also reduce emissions which would be good for the environment. The Council was working towards the leisure centre which would allow the re-introduction of a park-and-ride scheme. This would in effect help keep cars out of the town centre. Charges were inevitable due to the effects of poor fiscal control by the Government, which meant less financial backing for grants to support communities. This Council had looked at all means to reduce its budgets but, with rising costs, there was not much room to manoeuvre. The car parks cost

money to maintain and all other towns charged for parking. The proposals should therefore be supported.

Councillor Michael Allan reminded the Committee that currently the Ely car parks were free. If charges were introduced then it could be expected that the supermarkets would also charge, as they did elsewhere.

Councillor James Palmer stated that the Council was in this position because of the budget situation and would not charge if it did not have to. Somebody had to pay for the car parks, which were costing £20,000 per month. The Councillors had a responsibility to run the Council to its budget so there should be no delay in introducing this scheme. The charges proposed were fair and any income over budget would be spent on the city centre. If the charges were not brought in then other services would have to be cut. The Committee were urged to vote the proposals through.

Councillor Gareth Wilson thought CPE was absolutely critical, otherwise there would be problems. The Scrutiny Committee had recommended that the Police undertake enforcement action. Residents also had to be borne in mind. Their problems, and that of low paid workers, should not be ignored as the charges were a lot to pay for them. Park-and-ride should be re-introduced on Saturdays, as this would allow parking for nothing with access to the town centre. Perhaps implementation of the charging regime should be postponed.

Councillor Gareth Wilson therefore proposed an amendment that the proposals be approved but that the introduction of the scheme be agreed at a future meeting of the Development and Transport Committee. This being duly seconded, it was put to the vote and declared lost.

The report recommendations plus the recommendations from Scrutiny Committee were then proposed and seconded. Upon being put to the vote it was declared carried.

It was resolved:

- (i) That the comments and recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee held on 27<sup>th</sup> November on the joint proposal for car parking be agreed; [See note 1]
- (ii) That the consultation on the proposals detailed in paragraph 4.1 for the introduction of off-street car parking charges and the Draft Off Street Parking Places Order 2013 incorporating this proposal, detailed in Appendix 1, be approved;
- (iii) That the timetable for consultation and implementation of the proposals, as detailed in paragraph 5.1, be agreed;
- (iv) That the Head of Community Services be instructed (on a without prejudice basis) to commence the procurement of the required new car parking infrastructure and services needed to implement the proposal.

*Councillors Anna Bailey, Elaine Griffin-Singh and James Palmer left the meeting at this point.*

93. **FINAL DRAFT – EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN**

The Committee considered a report, reference M177, and a revised Option Assessment Results document previously circulated, which set out the Local Plan, a vision and strategy for the future growth and development of the district up to 2031.

The Principal Forward Planning Officer advised the Committee that the version before them was slightly revised and she proceeded to give a presentation on the amendments. An additional recommendation was tabled relating to further work needing to be carried out in Burwell and Fordham. For Burwell attempts had been made to arrange a Working Party but this would not be held until January, so a report would go to the January meeting of this Committee. Relating to Fordham, as discussed with Mr Moffatt, there was some weakness in the consultation so there was some merit in doing a targeted consultation in Mildenhall Road, Fordham. This would give a clear community view and satisfy procedural points.

Councillor Neil Morrison asked how many questionnaires had been distributed and how many received back. The Committee was informed that the numbers depended on the support of the particular parish council. Only some settlements had received hand delivered questionnaires but publicity campaigns had been conducted. Councillor Gareth Wilson commented that some people did not quite understand the questions, particularly over growth.

The Principal Forward Planning Officer stated that Isleham Parish Council had been used to debate its parish issues. The Parish Council preferred 4 sites but, as Site 4 had been objected to by English Heritage due to its proximity to Isleham Priory, only 3 had been recommended.

Councillor Derrick Beckett understood the objections of English Heritage but thought the Parish Council's view should carry more weight than English Heritage. Site 4 was on a busy thoroughfare and, if approved, could provide a footpath on the busy corner. The setting of the historical monument had been invisible because of some trees, which had now been removed. The Parish Council felt Site 4 was a justifiable development so it was requested that Site 4 go forward.

Site 9, land off Cotes Drove, was originally a large site and the Parish Council had objected to the scale. The landowner had come up with a revised plan and had consulted Highways about access via Church Lane. The Parish Council had objected but there was no merit in it. So this site should also be considered for inclusion.

Councillor Peter Moakes reminded the Committee that it was to decide on the sites to be included in the public consultation. If the landowner wanted his land involved he should put forward his plan. It would be difficult to de-allocate land but it would be better to allocate more than otherwise needed in case some allocated land did not come forward for development.

Councillor Gareth Wilson suggested that all the sites be included in the consultation and that English Heritage put their objections in during this consultation. He duly proposed the inclusion of all the potential sites in Isleham and this was agreed.

*Councillor Colin Fordham left the meeting at this point.*

Councillor Hazel Williams was concerned that sites highlighted in Pymoor were in the flood plain. The Principal Forward Planning Officer revealed that the Flood Risk Assessments had been completed and signed off.

With regards Sutton, Councillor Philip Read had commented that he thought more than 50 dwellings should go forward, though the Parish Council view was for up to 50. It was recommended that part of two sites should go forward for consultation.

Councillor Gareth Wilson noted that between the 2 sites supported by Wentworth Parish Council were some garages owned by Sanctuary Hereward. They could potentially sell this land for dwellings. The Principal Forward Planning Officer agreed to check the view of the Parish Council on this issue.

Councillor Robert Stevens said that Bottisham was intensively developed but the BOT1 site was supposed to have new allotments, a play area as well as 50 houses. He questioned whether that could be achieved within the site boundary. The Committee was told that the boundary had been measured, though it might need to be shifted. The area would need a Masterplan.

Councillor Tom Kerby was concerned about the consultation held in Fordham and its results. A landowner had been asked whether he wished his land included but he did not want to take part. 2 sites had scored highly in the consultation – Sites 8 and 11. With regard to Site 8, the public did not realise that it was in fact 2 sites. After the consultation the land, Site 16, had then come forward but had only been considered by the Parish Council and it had been added in. What was the point of the consultation if this site was added in afterwards? He would not be happy to ask the public again about the sites. The community had given its views so the next question should be how quickly the land would become available for development. The Council could not just keep adding sites afterwards.

Councillor Gareth Wilson reminded the Committee that this was a new procedure and Fordham had not had a door-to-door delivery of the questionnaire. In future everyone should get a delivery through their doors.

Councillor Mike Rouse proposed that Sites 8 and 11 in Fordham should be the options considered for next stage consultation, so there would be no need for the suggested additional consultation on options. Councillor Robert Stevens pointed out that this meant only part of Site 11. This was duly seconded and when put to the vote was declared carried. It was confirmed that this meant Site 16 would not be included.

Councillor Peter Moakes suggested that the Head of Planning and Sustainable Development and the Principal Forward Planning Officer come back with a specific view about the review period for the Village Visions. The Head of

Planning and Sustainable Development advised that some areas would need to be reviewed quicker than others and that some text would be included explaining the targeting of reviews. The Principal Forward Planning Officer explained that there would be an annual monitoring report each year presented to the Committee for consideration.

Councillor Mike Rouse wanted more local Member involvement so proposed that recommendation 2.1 (iii) include the words “and relevant local Members”. This was agreed.

The recommendations as revised were put to the Committee and agreed.

It was resolved:

- (i) That the draft Local Plan (attached as Appendix 1) be approved for public consultation purposes, subject to the following agreed changes:
  - (a) All potential sites in Isleham be included in the public consultation;
  - (b) Sites 8 and 11 only be the preferred options for Fordham;
  - (c) The Burwell Village Vision be included;
- (ii) That the draft Final Sustainability Appraisal document (attached as Appendix 2) be approved for public consultation purposes;
- (iii) That subsequent changes to the documents prior to publication be delegated to the Head of Planning and Sustainable development in consultation with the Chairman of this Committee and relevant local Members.
- (iv) That further work be carried out relating to the Burwell and Fordham Village Visions and reported back to this Committee in January 2013.

*Councillors Derrick Beckett and Hazel Williams MBE left the meeting at this point.*

#### 94. **COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY – EXAMINERS REPORT**

The Committee considered a report, reference M178, previously circulated, which detailed the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), following receipt of the Inspector’s report.

The Principal Forward Planning Officer advised the Committee that, a successful Levy being achieved, the next steps were to put CIL to full Council for adoption. Once adopted, an implementation date of 1<sup>st</sup> February 2013 had been set. This would mean that a fair amount of work would be needed to set up the necessary processes relating to managing CIL.

Two new additional recommendations were tabled, which detailed some operational work that needed to be done. This would entail delegating some aspects of CIL to this Committee, as this would be more manageable rather than having these aspects going through full Council. A new CIL instalments policy would be needed, with a Regulation 123 list of infrastructure projects, and this would be presented to full Council.

In response to Councillor Tony Goodge's query, the Committee was advised that there was a complex calculation needed to work out specific charge rates which related to floor spaces. Due to its complexity the charging schedule only referred to the equation in the Regulations, rather than attempt to detail them.

It was resolved to RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL:

- (i) That the Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule (attached as Appendix 1 to this report) be adopted by the District Council;
- (ii) That the proposed implementation date when the Charging Schedule would take effect, of 1<sup>st</sup> February 2013, be endorsed;
- (iii) That the recommendations and content of the Inspector's report (attached as Appendix 2 to this report) be noted;
- (iv) That the Head of Legal & Democratic Services be authorised to amend the Terms of Reference for the Development & Transport Committee to delegate elements of the CIL - related decision making to the Committee/ Head of Service.

It was resolved:

- (v) That Committee instruct the Head of Planning & Sustainable Development to draft a CIL instalments policy and Regulation 123 list, in consultation with the Chair of this Committee, for presentation to Council on 8<sup>th</sup> January 2013.

95. **BROAD STREET DEVELOPMENT SECTION 106 HOUSING FUNDS –  
TEMPORARY HOUSING**

The Committee considered a report, reference M179, previously circulated, which looked at the use of the Broad Street Section 106 (S106) housing contribution towards refurbishment of proposed new temporary accommodation provision.

The Head of Housing suggested to the Committee that the S106 money be spent on bringing temporary accommodation into use to help alleviate the use of bed-and-breakfast accommodation for homeless people. £30,000 could be invested in the Littleport Hostel, as a loan, which could be paid back if the hostel were sold. Temporary accommodation in Soham, the caretaker's bungalow, could be brought into use and the County Council would be asked for a contribution. A gentleman in Ely with a large house had offered this for temporary accommodation. Appendix 1 to the report detailed all the items that were going ahead.

Councillor Mike Rouse stated that there was an urgency to get this work done. As there would be a management gap when the Head of Housing left, the Chief Executive and Deputy Chief Executive should be instructed to carry this forward as a matter of urgency. This was duly proposed and agreed.

The Democratic Services Officer reminded the Committee that revised recommendations had been circulated before the meeting. These were therefore proposed and agreed.

It was resolved:

- (i) That the unallocated S106 funding held by the Council as identified in paragraph 3.4 be used to refurbish a number of properties to be used as temporary accommodation for the homeless to alleviate the current high revenues spend on bed and breakfast accommodation;
- (ii) That the Head of Housing be authorised in consultation with the Chairman of Development and Transport Committee to allocate up to £87,329 to specific projects to implement the above recommendation;
- (iii) That Chief Executive and Deputy Chief Executive be instructed to carry this forward as a matter of urgency.

96. **ALLOCATIONS POLICY FOR EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE**

The Committee considered a report, reference M180, previously circulated, which set out the new allocations policy.

The Head of Housing advised the Committee that the Allocations Policy had been revised and now included people on military service. Paragraph 3.3.1 in the draft Policy defined what was meant by a 'local connection'. This meant that people who did not have this connection would not sit on the housing register. The Policy had also been revised so that local people who had moved away would not be discriminated against should they wish to move back.

Councillor Robert Stevens pointed out that the Committee had previously agreed that the words "and any adjacent parish" should be included when referring to people having a local connection.

It was resolved:

That the draft allocations policy presented at Appendix 1 be approved and adopted.

The meeting concluded at 4:52pm.