



EAST
CAMBRIDGESHIRE
DISTRICT COUNCIL

AGENDA ITEM 4

STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES

Minutes of a Meeting held in the Council Chamber, The Grange,
Nutholt Lane, Ely, on Tuesday 16 June 2009 at 2.30pm.

PRESENT

Councillor Peter Moakes (Chairman)
Councillor John Abbott
Councillor Ian Allen
Councillor Fred Brown
Councillor Christine Bryant
Councillor Tony Cornell
Councillor Mark Duckworth (substitute for Councillor John Seaman
MBE)
Councillor Tony Parramint
Councillor Mike Rouse

OFFICERS

Rosemary Burton – Conservation Officer
Ann Caffall - Infrastructure and Project Officer (until end of Minute
No.14)
Katie Child – Principal Forward Planning Officer (until end of Minute
No.19)
Simon Fraser - Performance Review Officer (until end of Minute
No.19)
Sarah Gibling - Forward Planning Officer (until end of Minute
No.14)
Alan Gillham – Planning Policy Team Leader (until end of Minute
No.14)
Linda Grinnell – Head of Finance (until end of Minute No.16)
Darren Hill - Team Leader, Business Development (until end of
Minute No.14)
Jane Hollingworth – Head of Housing (for Minute No.19 only)
Giles Hughes – Head of Planning and Sustainable Development
Liz Knox – Head of Environmental Services (until end of Minute
No.17)
Eileen Oliver – Transport Policy Officer (until end of Minute No.14)
Melanie Stimpson – Democratic Services Officer
Abigail Taylor - Forward Planning Officer (until end of Minute
No.14)
Brendan Troy – Forward Planning Officer (until end of Minute
No.14)

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE

Councillor Jackie Petts

1 member of the public and 1 representative of the press attended the meeting.

6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

No questions were received.

7. APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTIONS

An apology for absence was received from Cllr Seaman MBE. Cllr Duckworth attended as the substitute member for Cllr Seaman MBE. An apology for absence was also received from David Archer, Executive Director, Development Services.

8. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of Personal or Prejudicial interests from Members on any item on the Agenda.

9. MINUTES

It was resolved:

That the Minutes of the meetings held on 21 April and 19 May 2009 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

10. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman made the following announcements:

Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) Review

Cambridgeshire County Council had submitted its formal advice to the East of England Regional Assembly (EERA) on the review of the Regional Spatial Strategy.

The advice was prepared in partnership with the districts in the County through the Cambridgeshire RSS Review Panel. The advice stated that very high-level growth scenarios were not realistic for Cambridgeshire. The favoured approach was to continue with the current strategy (75,000 homes) for the delivery of development in and on the edge of Cambridge at North West

Cambridge, Cambridge Southern Fringe and Cambridge East and at the new town of Northstowe with planned expansion also of market towns.

If flexibility for further growth was required, this would be limited in scale (no more than 15,000 homes overall) and would be provided only where justifiable and deliverable.

Beyond 75,000 homes the next option was to enhance the role of market towns in selected locations where job growth, regeneration and appropriate infrastructure improvements could support further housing development helping to make these towns more self-contained. Alongside this, there might be some limited potential for sustainable expansion at other towns with excellent transport links.

Further development in the Cambridge Green Belt was not an immediate priority. There were considerable doubts about the viability of any further new settlements and Mereham was mentioned as no longer worthy of consideration.

EERA would consider the advice in preparing options for public consultation. The consultation period for these options was likely to be from the 2 September until 24 November 2009.

Core Strategy – Examination

A series of hearings (known as Examination in Public) were recently held in Littleport, between 29 April and 13 May 2009. These hearings were presided over by an Independent Inspector and focused on various parts of the Core Strategy, including the overall strategy, housing numbers, employment growth, and infrastructure and deliverability issues. The Examination in Public appeared to go well and the Council put up a strong case.

The next stage in the process was that the Inspector was due to publish her report in early August 2009. The report would set out whether the Core Strategy was 'sound' or not, could propose changes and would be binding on the Council.

The Core Strategy would hopefully be published in Autumn 2009, which would follow consideration of the Inspectors report by Strategic Development Committee followed by a recommendation to Full Council for adoption.

11. HOUSING GROWTH FUND/MASTERPLAN UPDATE

The Committee considered a report, (J30), previously circulated, containing an update on progress with the delivery of the Housing Growth Fund and Masterplan projects.

Cambridgeshire Horizons had allocated £685,000 from the Housing Growth Funds to finance a range of infrastructure projects in East Cambridgeshire. During 2009/10 the key elements of expenditure were listed in paragraph 3.1 of the officer's report.

It was intended that work on the Littleport Masterplan would commence during autumn 2009 and in view of the work commitment it was recommended that outside consultants be employed to carry out the study, supported by the Economic Development team.

Regarding the Infrastructure Investment Strategy the project would identify the key infrastructure facilities that were required across the District to support the anticipated future growth levels. Approval was given at the November meeting of the Strategic Development Committee to proceed with this work with the use of external consultants. Interviews for consultants were held in May 2009 and EDAW consultants had been appointed to carry out the project. The first stage of their work commenced in June with an assessment of the current gaps in infrastructure provision and the likely infrastructure needs for various growth scenarios. The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development explained that EDAW had a considerable amount of experience in this field and had produced a similar strategy for Huntingdonshire District Council.

Cllr Brown stated that there had been much work undertaken with the Ely Masterplan and Soham Masterplan. Rather than employ another consultant Cllr Brown suggested that some of the work already undertaken for the Ely and Soham Masterplans could be utilised for the Littleport Masterplan, as there were issues that were general for all three Masterplans as well as across the district. This had been demonstrated from the comments generated from the Ely Masterplan and Soham Masterplan consultation exercises. Cllr Brown believed that the Littleport Masterplan should concentrate on Littleport and that due to its uniqueness, the south of the district should be considered separately.

The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development agreed that the scope of the Littleport Masterplan would need to be carefully considered to ensure that the Masterplan was appropriate to Littleport.

Cllr Rouse explained that interconnectivity was key to the Masterplans as Ely, Littleport and Soham were not far apart. It was important that the Masterplans complimented each other and that links between key settlements were established.

It was resolved:

That the Strategic Development Committee:

- i. Note the decision in respect of the appointment of EDAW Consultants to carry out the development of the District wide Infrastructure Investment Strategy.
- ii. Agree the proposal that external consultants be employed to prepare the Littleport Masterplan.

12. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT 2007/2008

The Committee considered a report, (J31), previously circulated, to note the contents of the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) and to recommend to Council that the Annual Monitoring Report 2007/2008 be adopted. The AMR was a requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and a statutory part of the Local Development Framework (LDF). The AMR was designed principally to provide information on a range of development related statistical matters, progress on the implementation of the Local Development Scheme and monitoring on the implementation of planning policy.

The Council was required to submit the AMR to GO-East for comment. No comments or objections had been received from GO-East regarding its content; therefore the AMR could be recommended to Council for adoption.

The Forward Planning Officer, Sarah Gibling, explained that the key findings of the AMR were listed within paragraph 4.3 of the officer's report and particularly highlighted the key findings in relation to housing. During 2007/2008 the Council had successfully completed 753 dwellings, 152 of which were affordable, and during April 2008 – March 2009 the Council had completed 470 dwellings. Both figures exceeded the forecast figures for the district as well as the Regional Spatial Strategy Annual Target.

Cllr Brown commended the Council and all officers involved in the process for achieving those results. If the Council could continue to overachieve it would remain ahead of the set targets.

In response to questions, the Forward Planning Officer explained that draft figures provided by the County Council Research and Monitoring Team indicated that the Council had performed well in 2008/2009 compared to other Cambridgeshire authorities. If completions were analysed relative to each district's existing dwelling stock then only Cambridge City performed better. The Forward Planning Officer further added that the district target for dwelling completions was 430 dwellings per year.

It was resolved TO RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL:

That the Local Development Framework Annual Monitoring Report 2007/2008 be adopted.

It was also resolved:

That the Strategic Development Committee note the content of the Annual Monitoring Report 2007/2008 (attached as Appendix 1 to the report).

13. SOHAM MASTERPLAN VISION

The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development presented a report (J32), previously circulated, to provide an update on the Soham Masterplan Vision and the initial draft framework principles and assumptions from consultants Entec.

A meeting of the Soham Masterplan Vision Working Party had taken place on the 15 June 2009. The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development reported that there had been a good attendance at the meeting and those attending seemed to have a positive attitude towards the Masterplan. At the meeting ENTEC had delivered a presentation on the draft framework assumptions, some of which had been quite radical. One issue that needed to be addressed was access to the centre of Soham. One proposal was a new eastern gateway to create a direct link between the bypass and the centre of Soham. There were key strategic choices that required further work before the next stage of consultation. During the public consultation it would be necessary to engage local landowners for a response to proposals.

Cllr Brown tabled an additional recommendation; *'This Committee instructs the Chief Executive to report to the next meeting, recommendations of the best way to take the implementations of Masterplans forward within the Member arena'*, which was proposed and seconded. Cllr Brown explained the reason that it was introduced was to ensure that the implementation of the Masterplans and how they would be taken forward were fully considered, which included both current and future Masterplans, and to ensure that the Masterplans worked together and not as piecemeal documents.

Cllr Rouse wondered when the Masterplans would have some authority. The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development explained that the Masterplans would support the Council's existing Core Strategy initially in the short term. Over the long term the Masterplans would be a supplementary planning document, which would provide background detail on the longer-term plans for Ely. Cllr Rouse wanted to ensure that the existing development policies were robust. The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development explained that

there did already exist policies that could be utilised, as necessary, for various types of planning applications.

Cllr Brown was mindful that there did already exist policies that could be used, especially in the event of larger planning applications. However the additional recommendation would ensure that the Masterplans were available as an additional tool sooner rather than later.

Cllr Allen referred to the additional recommendation and sought clarification regarding part of the recommendation that stated 'within the Member arena'. Cllr Brown explained that once the Masterplans were finalised there was currently nothing in place to progress them to the next stage.

Cllr Allen understood the Masterplans were to be a background document to which applications were set against and wondered how the Masterplans would be implemented. The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development explained that there was implementation work to be undertaken. The Local Development Framework was to comprise two separate documents, one of which was to be an Area Action Plan Development Plan Document (DPD), which the Masterplans would supplement. It was also noted that the Terms of Reference for the Working Party did not take account of the implementation and member involvement with the Masterplans.

Cllr Abbott noted that there might be initiatives underway to reinstate disused railways lines. If so, the Soham Masterplan should consider incorporating a railway station in Soham.

Following a number of questions the Head of Planning and Sustainable Development explained that once Council had adopted the Masterplans they could then be given official consideration. Public consultation of the Soham Masterplan had initially been planned for early autumn. However, this was now likely to take part during November/December.

Cllr Duckworth noted that it would be necessary for the Working Party to try to maintain the timetable due to future planning applications and again the robustness of the current planning policy was queried. The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development explained that the current policies already offered good guidance, for instance, PPS6 offered guidance on retail in town centres.

It was resolved:

That Strategic Development Committee:

- i. Notes the comments made by the Soham Masterplan Vision Working Party meeting on the 15 June 2009, as verbally reported.

- ii. Instructs the Chief Executive to report to the next meeting of the Strategic Development Committee, recommendations of the best way to take the implementation of Masterplans forward within the Member arena.

14. ELY MASTERPLAN – UPDATE REPORT

The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development presented a report (J33), previously circulated, to provide an update on the progress with the Ely Masterplan.

A meeting of the Ely Masterplan/Growth Delivery Working Party had taken place on the 15 June 2009. The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development reported that there had been a good attendance at the meeting. The Working Party had not made any recommendations, although had received a number of presentations. One of the presentations delivered was by Caroline Cannon of ATKINS regarding the transport modelling study, which was not yet complete. The transport modelling study had been based on a Reference Case, which was a forecast of what the traffic in and around Ely would be in the year 2031. This had demonstrated that additional traffic would be generated. The transport modelling study had also considered various growth scenarios and the potential impact of how a southern bypass could mitigate traffic. The transport modelling study had demonstrated that it would decrease congestion created from growth, when complimented with a mix of road schemes and necessary infrastructure.

The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development further explained that the Working Party also received a presentation, which included housing densities and Development Framework Proposals. One of the opportunity sites for development in the city centre was to develop the various passageways. The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development confirmed that once the work of the transport modelling study was complete that it would be available to members. The draft Masterplan would be presented to the Ely Masterplan/Growth Delivery Working Party meeting at the end of July.

Cllr Allen referred to the notes of the previous Working Party meeting, as he had asked whether the Transport Study could be made available well before the next Working Party meeting. The Executive Director had agreed that the Study document could be sent out in good time. However, Cllr Allen was very disappointed that the transport modelling study was incomplete and that the information had not been distributed at the same time as the agenda. The issue of transport was essential and members required proper information in due time. Cllr Allen noted a number of critical points from the presentation; that irrespective of what happened in the future there would be an increase in the traffic generated – an increase of 39% in the total number of trips; an increase of 5,000 dwellings would significantly increase congestion; the presentation had also referred to network speeds and delays. The Masterplan could reduce congestion

but depending on the proposed increase in housing Cllr Allen suggested that congestion could also be increased. Cllr Allen hoped that Members could have a substantial discussion about this issue in the future.

The Chairman confirmed that measures to counteract congestion would be introduced that related to the chosen growth scenario. Cllr Allen explained that following informal discussions with a County Council Highways Advisor, improvements to the road network, such as duelling the A10, to support growth would cost a significant amount of money.

Cllr Bryant enquired if costings for the transport improvements were known. The Chairman explained that ranges of options were being considered and that it was too early to estimate costs associated with the transport improvements.

Cllr Brown explained that by undertaking the transport work together with the Masterplan would help to reduce the number of additional dwellings imposed on the district by government. The Masterplan needed to be appropriate to the area and robust. Railway improvement to accommodate further trains would also help to alleviate congestion and Cllr Brown suggested that it might not be necessary to duel the entire A10.

Cllr Cornell felt that the ultimate driver for the Masterplan should ultimately be the vision of the Masterplan and not the issues that would need to be overcome to achieve the Masterplan. Cllr Rouse stated that the Masterplan should be a representation of what the electorate wanted which could be achieved with intelligent planning.

Prior to agreeing the recommendation it was noted that the additional recommendation, as agreed in the previous minute, was also applicable to this item.

It was resolved:

That the Strategic Development Committee:

- i. Notes the contents of the report.
- ii. Instructs the Chief Executive to report to the next meeting of the Strategic Development Committee recommendations of the best way to take the implementation of Masterplans forward within the Member arena.

15. ANNUAL REPORTS OF REPRESENTATIVES ON OUTSIDE BODIES

The Committee considered a report, (J34), previously circulated, to receive the Annual Reports from appointed Council representatives on the activities and manner in which funding was spent by the outside bodies within the responsibility of Strategic Development Committee.

Cllr Abbott apologised that no report had been included in the information page relating to the 'Supporting People – Joint Members' Board'. However, since the publication of the agenda Cllr Abbott had submitted his report, which in summary stated that continued representation on the outside body was worthwhile as it was essential for people in difficult circumstances. The Supporting People – Joint Members' Board monitored decisions about the apportionment of money to many bodies throughout the county for the housing of people with a variety of needs. It was important for the District to be represented on the Board, as not all authorities had the same priorities as East Cambridgeshire District Council.

Cllr Rouse noted that during 2008/2009 he had been one of the two district council representatives on the Sanctuary Hereward, East of England Committee and had been replaced by Cllr Cornell. Due to the current relations between the Council and Sanctuary regarding changes to the Committee a report from the Council's representatives had not been submitted.

Cllr Brown explained that due to the proposed changes, that the East of England Committee be replaced with a Consumer Panel, which would result in the Council forfeiting one of its current two seats, discussions were currently underway between Sanctuary Hereward and the Council to try to resolve this, as it was important that the Council had representation. It was valuable that the Council was represented on some of the outside bodies to ensure that the Council was involved and informed.

It was noted that the Council representation on the Regional Spatial Strategy Joint Membership Review Panel was the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Spokesperson of the Strategic Development Committee. Therefore Cllr Brown, as the new Vice Chairman of the Strategic Development Committee, would be appointed to replace Cllr Rouse.

It was resolved:

- i. That the Annual Reports from appointed Council representatives on the activities and manner in which funding was spent by the outside bodies within the responsibility of Strategic Development Committee be noted.

- ii. That Cllr F Brown, as the new Vice Chairman of the Strategic Development Committee, be appointed to replace Cllr Rouse on the Regional Spatial Strategy Joint Membership Review Panel.

16. BUDGET MONITORING REPORT

The Committee received a report, (J35) previously circulated, which reported for consideration the 2008/09 outturn position of income and expenditure against budget for the services within this Committee's responsibilities as set out in Appendix 1 of the report.

The Head of Finance explained that the Strategic Development Committee had overall underspent by £62,526 against the original approved budget of £1,806,209 and had underspent by £228,160 against the latest projected budget of £1,971,663. The main variances to the budget were listed in paragraph 3.9 of the officer's report.

It was resolved:

That the report be noted.

17. LITTLEPORT EMPTY HOMES PROJECT

The Committee received a report for information, (J36) previously circulated, regarding the Littleport Empty Homes Project.

The Head of Environmental Services explained that the Council had been awarded £400,000 to spend over the next two financial years. The overall aim of the project was to provide advice and financial assistance in the form of grants and loans to owners of the 65 long-term empty properties that had been identified in the Littleport Area.

The financial assistance would enable the empty homes to be restored for occupation or for rentable use and remove the negative impact these properties had on the neighbourhoods in Littleport. It could also provide opportunities for first time buyers.

Littleport had been chosen for the focus of this investment because it had consistently higher levels of long-term empty properties compared to the national average, district as a whole and other towns/villages of comparable size. To promote the initiative an information day was being hosted on 27 June from 11am – 3pm in Littleport Village Hall.

The Head of Environmental Services explained that the initiative was welcomed, as it had previously been difficult to encourage owners to restore

empty homes. Four to six owners had already expressed an interest in the scheme.

Cllr Abbott enquired if all empty homes were currently uninhabitable. The Head of Environmental Services explained that the condition of each of the properties varied and some properties might only require a small amount of financial assistance. However, to be eligible all properties would need to have been empty for at least six months.

Cllr Brown stated that the invitation for the Council to apply for grant money for the Empty Home Project had been without warning and therefore officers had undertaken a considerable amount of work in a short amount of time. Cllr Brown commended the officers involved on the successful award of £400,000. The financial assistance would definitely assist Littleport as it experienced a number of empty homes that had been vacant for some time.

Cllr Allen enquired who had devised the grant and loan criteria. The Head of Environmental Services explained that the Council had established the criteria and summarised that grant assistance was limited to £10,000 per property and the loans were limited to £20,000 per property. An individual could receive funding through both grant and loan assistance totalling £30,000. Loans would be granted interest free but upon the sale of the property must be repaid in full. Regarding grants, if a property was sold within ten years of receipt of a grant then the money had to be repaid in full to the Council. After ten years the requirement to repay the grant was withdrawn.

Cllr Duckworth enquired if there was an approximate age to the properties. The Head of Environmental Services explained that the ages of the properties varied. Cllr Cornell stated that the project was very positive for Littleport, although did wonder whether it would be detrimental to other areas of the district. The Head of Environmental Services explained that if the project was successful and if there was the opportunity to apply for further funding then the project could be considered elsewhere in the district. There would also be the opportunity to recirculate the loan and any grant funding that was repaid it.

It was resolved:

That the report be noted.

At the conclusion of this item Cllr Brown left the Council Chamber and did not return to the meeting.

18. GRANTS FOR THE REPAIR OF HISTORIC BUILDINGS AND BUILDINGS IN CONSERVATION AREAS

The Committee received a report, (J37) previously circulated, to note the delegated grant offers, as per paragraph 3.1 of the officer's report, for information.

The Conservation Officer drew Members attention to the budget report, appendix one, as a significant amount of money had been recycled from various returned grants, some dating back to 1993.

The Conservation Officer noted that £40 had been listed in the budget statement relating to the fee for registering the land charge with the Land Registry for Sextry House. Future applications would include this as part of the grant offered.

The Chairman enquired if the grants for the repair of historic buildings and buildings in conservation areas were now time limited. The Conservation Officer explained that the grants were now time limited for one year, unless a sufficient reason was offered.

It was resolved:

That the grants offered under the delegation scheme, as set out in paragraph 3.1 of the officer's report, be noted.

19. CORPORATE PLAN INDICATORS – END OF YEAR MONITORING REPORT

The Committee considered a report, (J38) previously circulated, to report year-end performance and actions for all Corporate Plan indicators that report to the Strategic Development Committee.

The Performance Review Officer highlighted that the Corporate Plan indicators that report to the Strategic Development Committee were listed on page three of the officer's report.

The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development explained that a number of the indicators were on target. The net additional homes provided target, NI154, was not highlighted as achieved, as the data was not available until June or July each year. The reason for this was that the County Council conducted an annual housing completions survey on behalf of all Cambridgeshire local authorities during April/May. The final figures for each district were published after further checks of the survey work had been undertaken. It was noted that in previous years this target had been achieved.

Regarding indicator NII97 - Proportion of Local Sites where positive conservation management had been or was being implemented, the Head of Planning and Sustainable Development explained that although the issue was important there was currently little action that could be taken locally, within existing resources, that would influence the performance for this indicator and suggested that it might be appropriate to delete the indicator from the Corporate Plan as it was of less strategic significance. In response to a question, the Performance Review Officer explained that the issue with the indicator was that it considered Cambridgeshire as a whole and was not an important East Cambridgeshire District Council local priority. Cambridgeshire County Council was a main driver regarding the indicator.

Cllr Allen suggested that the Council would have some influence on indicator NII97 because of the new Country Park in Ely. Cllr Allen did not agree with the removal of the indicator, as any contribution would be a bonus. The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development explained that it was unlikely that the Country Park would be recognised by the indicator.

Referring to indicator NI155, which measured the number of new units of affordable housing provided, the Head of Housing explained that the target was increased to 150 per annum in 2005 from 110, and that the target was not met in 2008/9 due to the overall slowing of developments and fewer units coming forward through planning agreements. From 2005 to 2008 the Council had exceeded the target. However it was unlikely that in 2009/10 the target would be met because of the credit crunch, sites stalling and because no new section 106 sites had commenced in the last year, and because housing which had been scheduled to complete in 2009/10 was delivered earlier, in 2008/9. A revised target had therefore been submitted to GO-East for consideration reducing the target of 150 units per annum to 129 units per annum.

Cllr Allen noted that there was always more demand for affordable homes than what the Council could achieve. Policy and Resources Committee were due to consider a report regarding a site, which could potentially provide affordable homes. Cllr Allen suggested that the Committee should positively encourage the Policy and Resources Committee to agree the scheme and that the maximum amount of affordable housing on the site should try to be achieved. The Head of Housing explained that to meet the current housing need 500 dwellings per annum would be required.

Cllr Duckworth was concerned at the rate the district was underachieving at meeting the need. The Head of Housing explained that this was due to a number of factors such as the average persons wage made it impossible to get onto the housing ladder, due to the current economic climate more people were experiencing mortgage repossessions, particularly those in the building trade, and mortgage repossessions were also affecting those in rented properties. The

Head of Housing did note that the Home Buyer Direct Scheme was meeting some of the affordable housing need.

It was resolved:

That the Strategic Development Committee:

- i. Notes the year-end performance report for the Council's Corporate Plan, as attached as Appendix A to the officer's report.
- ii. Notes the exception reports, and any actions contained therein, as attached as Appendix B to the officer's report.

20. ACTIONS TAKEN ON GROUNDS OF URGENCY – APPOINTMENT OF CONTRACTOR – ELY MASTERPLAN DESIGN WORKSHOPS

The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development presented a report (J39), previously circulated, to inform the Strategic Development Committee of a contract accepted as an exception to the normal tendering procedures, in accordance with the Council's constitution (Ref 4(49)).

In January 2009 approval was given to proceed with proposals for design workshops in connection with the development process for the Ely Masterplan. Expert external support was required for these workshops, and Shape East was identified as an appropriate organisation to carry out this work, in view of their experience with workshop facilitation particularly in relation to planning and architectural issues. However, it was not possible to complete the normal tendering process, which would have taken some three to four months to carry out, without introducing lengthy delays to the Ely Masterplan process. Therefore an exception was granted to the normal tendering procedures in accordance with the Council's constitution, as was now being reported.

It was resolved:

That the Strategic Development Committee notes the action taken on grounds of urgency, regarding the appointment of a contractor for the Ely Masterplan Design Workshops.

21. ELY MASTERPLAN/GROWTH DELIVERY WORKING PARTY NOTES

It was resolved:

That the draft notes of the Ely Masterplan/Growth Delivery Working Party meeting on 2 April 2009 be noted:

The meeting finished at 3.57pm.