

**DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE MINUTES**

Minutes of a Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Nutholt Lane, Ely on Tuesday 14<sup>th</sup> January 2014 at 2:00pm.

**P R E S E N T**

Councillor Peter Moakes (Chairman)  
Councillor David Ambrose Smith  
Councillor Derrick Beckett (as Substitute for Councillor Colin Fordham)  
Councillor David Brown  
Councillor Sheila Friend-Smith MBE  
Councillor Tom Hunt  
Councillor Tom Kerby  
Councillor Neil Morrison  
Councillor Tony Parramint (as Substitute for Councillor Allen Alderson)  
Councillor Mike Rouse  
Councillor Robert Stevens

**OTHER ATTENDEES**

Councillor Lis Every  
Councillor Bill Hunt  
Shirley Blake – Principal Sustainable Development Officer  
Sally Bonnett – Infrastructure & Projects Officer  
Lorraine Brown – Conservation Officer  
Jo Brooks – Principal Housing Officer  
Katie Child – Principal Forward Planning Officer  
Oliver Cook – Development & Enabling Officer  
Louise Duffield - Accountancy Assistant  
Karen Freya – Principal Housing Officer (Strategy & Development)  
Giles Hughes – Head of Planning & Sustainable Development  
Stewart Patience – Forward Planning Officer  
Doug Perkins – Economic Development Officer  
Adrian Scaites-Stokes – Democratic Services Officer  
Jane Thompson – Special Projects Officer  
Members of the Public - 3

64. **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

There were no public questions.

65. **APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

Apologies were received from Councillors Allen Alderson and Colin Fordham. Councillors Tony Parramint and Derrick Beckett substituted for those Members for this meeting.

66. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

67. **MINUTES**

It was resolved:

That the minutes of the meeting held 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2013 be confirmed as a correct record and be signed by the Chairman.

68. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- As requested by the Committee I sent a letter to David Wilson Homes expressing the Council's concern over their changed position regarding the number of dwellings for the Bell Road site in Bottisham. They had decided to request 150 homes on this site. I am pleased to announce that David Eardley, Managing Director of David Wilson Homes, has responded withdrawing his firm's objection to the Local Plan, and confirming that they will focus instead on defending the Local Plan allocation for 50 homes. The Council will work with David Wilson Homes and Bottisham Parish Council to complete the draft Masterplan for the site.
- The Examination of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan will commence on 4th February 2014 at 10am, to be held in the Council Chamber at The Grange. It will run until Friday 14<sup>th</sup> February for a total of 7 days of hearings. The Secretary of State has appointed Michael Hetherington, an Inspector from the Planning Inspectorate, to consider the soundness of the Local Plan. The current programme for the hearings and the Inspector's list of Matters, Issues and Questions are set out on the Council's website. The Council's case at the Examination will be led by Giles Hughes and Katie Child, with the assistance of David Whipps, an expert Planning Solicitor from Holmes & Hills. Following the Examination the Inspector will prepare a report setting out his conclusions on the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan.
- G's in Soham and the National Institute of Agricultural Botany have submitted a bid to the Greater Cambridge, Greater Peterborough LEP's agri-tech fund under the innovation strand. The bid, which includes a wider range of public and private partners, focuses on the development of a redundant produce packing site in Soham into a research hub to provide a much needed base for applied crop production and waste reduction research for farmers, food processors and related industries. The bid will now be considered by the LEP along with the other bids submitted and an announcement is due in March. Further information can be obtained from Darren Hill, Business Development Manager.

- The District Council would be consulting on the draft Ely Station Gateway Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) from Monday 27<sup>th</sup> January – Friday 21<sup>st</sup> March 2014.

The Draft Ely Station Gateway Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) set out ambitious proposals to transform the station area into a vibrant mixed use urban quarter which would provide for employment expansion, enhanced transport interchange facilities as well as creating an attractive gateway to the city.

You could submit your comments via the draft Ely Station Gateway SPD questionnaire – see [www.eastcambs.gov.uk](http://www.eastcambs.gov.uk) or write/email/telephone – East Cambridgeshire District Council, The Grange, Nutholt Lane, Ely, Cambs, CB7 4EE, email - [growthdelivery@eastcambs.gov.uk](mailto:growthdelivery@eastcambs.gov.uk), telephone - 01353 665555.

Two public exhibitions where people could view and comment on the proposals were being held in the former Millets Store on Ely Market Place on Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> March 2014 from 2pm – 7pm and Saturday 8<sup>th</sup> March 2014 from 9am – 2pm.

- Members were reminded that agenda item no. 16, relating to the Newmarket Road Burwell Masterplan, had been withdrawn.

#### 69. **ELY TRAFFIC AND ENVIRONMENT STUDY**

The Committee considered a report, reference N182, previously circulated, on progress to date and allocation of Section 106 (S106) funding to projects following the Ely traffic and Environment Study.

The Infrastructure & Projects Officer advised the Committee that the Council had been working with the Highways Department to find out costs for the short list of projects, with consultants used on some of the costings. There were two potential packages of projects that could be undertaken. Package 1 covered highways and some town centre issues. This would include working with the Road Safety Team to look at some road junctions, the Lisle Lane to railway station cycle route, some town centre signage, cycle parking outside Waitrose and parking restrictions in Lisle Lane. The City of Ely Council had suggested some other potential works, such as an additional pedestrian crossing point over Broad Street nearer the Back Hill junction. Package 2 was the same as package 1 but with additional work to the Market Place.

The Conservation Officer advised the Committee that the issue of ownership of the Market Place had been looked at and there appeared to be no definite owner of the land, though the Highways Department had responsibility for the surface. The Council's Legal Department had advised that the Council could gain ownership of the land through "adverse possession" but had to provide evidence about the work the Council had done on the Market Place. The implications of ownership would mean that greater flexibility of use for the Market Place.

Improvements to the Market Place could include changing the surface, creating a focal point for use as an event space, introducing steps at the Fore Hill end, removing all the barriers. There was more work to be done and any projects had to be cost effective, sustainable and deliverable.

Work was also ongoing with the owners of the central building and funding options for potential work were being considered. More work was also needed on this and the issue would be brought back to this Committee.

Councillor Mike Rouse supported pursuing ownership of the Market Place through “adverse possession” but the Council needed to know about the plans for the central block. The projects of Package 1 should be done within the vicinity of Sainsburys. The City of Ely Council supported this and also had suggested a new crossing near St Peters Church in Broad Street and improvements at the Broad Street/Back Hill junction. There was unanimous support for the cycle lane, the Fore Hill and Broad Street change of priority into Waterside. Speed management in Lisle Lane was also supported but there were questions about the safety of pedestrians and cyclists when narrowing the road, the suggestion of a crossing at Springhead Lane and a link for cyclists on Prickwillow Road. Time was available so care could be taken when making improvements. Overall Package 1 and the acquisition of the Market Place should be supported.

Councillor Sheila Friend-Smith preferred Package 2, as Package 1 would leave the Market Place in limbo. She did agree about seeking ownership of the Market Place, so things could be done and it could be improved. The main issues of the Market Place related to market use, Highways issues and the central building. The Market Place surface should be changed but the sun dial should be moved.

Councillor Peter Moakes accepted that there was time to consider improvements and transport issues should be given priority. This would allow time for the people who were working on the central building issue.

Councillor Tom Kerby wanted to wait until after the upcoming Members’ town centres seminar where ideas for the future could come out. These ideas could then also be considered.

Councillor David Brown supported Package 1 and reminded the Committee that the funding could be spent within 10 years. Package 2 could not be supported as it was unclear what the money would be used on.

Councillor Robert Stevens did not think that the Market Place would qualify under the transport and environment category, and the money available was available to mitigate the impact of the new Sainsburys store. Therefore, cycling and traffic projects should be the priority.

The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development stated that the Section 106 agreement with Sainsbury had been broadly defined so it covered transport and environmental improvements, which could be used on the Market Place. Agreeing to Package 1 would still leave around £20K, which could then be used for the Market

Place. When there was some certainty about potential Tesco Section 106 money, this could be brought to the Committee for consideration.

Councillor Neil Morrison informed the Committee that the footpath along Lisle Lane was in a bad state, as lorries tended to park on it. This would need to be brought up to standard as part of the station cycle route.

It was proposed that Package 1 be agreed with consideration given to the comments of the City of Ely Council plus pursuing ownership of Market Place. This was duly seconded and agreed.

It was resolved:

- (i) That Package 1 of projects to progress, plus consideration of further projects suggested by the City of Ely Council, using the S106 developer contribution monies from the Sainsbury's Ely development towards traffic and environment works be agreed;
- (ii) That the progress to date on the Market Place Enhancement Project be noted;

It was further resolved to RECOMMEND TO ASSET DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE:

- (iii) That officers be instructed to pursue legal ownership of the Market Place for ECDC.

#### 70. **DISCHARGING HOMELESS DUTY INTO THE PRIVATE RENTED SECTOR**

The Committee considered a report, reference N183 previously circulated, which proposed a method to discharge the Council's homeless duty into the private rented sector, with an offer of a fixed term assured shorthold tenancy of 12 months.

The Principal Housing Officer advised the Committee that currently the Council only discharge its homeless duty by offering social housing. This had created problems as there was not enough such housing available. However, the under the Localism Act the Council was allowed to discharge its homeless duties by securing 12 month assured shorthold tenancies in the private sector. In the last six months the Council had regained trust with many landlords and now provides them with a Landlord Resolution. They come to the Council for help in solving tenant problems and as a result have offered properties for use. So it would be beneficial for the Council to discharge some of its duty into this sector. All properties offered would be checked out for suitability and affordability for the potential tenants. There would be no additional expense for the Council.

Councillor David Brown fully supported this new initiative and would rely on Council officers to ensure properties offered were fit-for-purpose.

In answer to Councillor Neil Morrison's questions, it was revealed that over 40 private landlords attended a recent event. Of those, approximately 12 were now regularly

offering properties for use. They would be provided with support from the Council with their tenancies and this helped prevent homelessness occurring. After the initial 12 month tenancy, the tenancy would continue and if there were any problems the landlords would come back to the Council for support.

Councillor Tom Kerby asked whether these landlords would accept tenants who were also benefit claimants. The Committee was advised that the landlords could decline such tenants, and at least 50% of those tenants would be on some form of benefit. However an agreement had been made with the Anglia Revenues Partnership (ARP) that if the tenant did not pass on their housing benefit to the landlord ARP would pay any housing benefit directly to them.

The recommendations were duly proposed, seconded and agreed.

It was resolved:

That the housing options team use this provision of a 12 month assured shorthold tenancy as an alternative way to discharge the Council's homeless duty.

71. **PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL'S ALLOCATIONS AND LETTINGS POLICY**

The Committee considered a report, reference N184 previously circulated, which outlined amendments to the Council's Allocations and Lettings Policy.

The Principal Housing Officer advised the Committee that THE Council was part of the Home Link scheme within the region, where councils tried to adhere to one policy though each local authority had its own differences. Should someone become unintentionally homeless then they would enter a 3-month bidding cycle for a new home. This meant that applicants were staying in temporary accommodation for a long time. To help ease the problem it was proposed that full duty homeless applicants be offered new homes from potentially 4 areas, as opposed to the current 2 areas. A household bid could be made but any offer could be refused without any penalty. To bring this Council's scheme in line with other authorities in the region it was proposed to widen the offers made from 2 to 4 areas to reduce the bidding time and any refusal would mean the next offer would be final, so people would have to accept it. An appeal system would be put in place so that people moving into those new homes could make an appeal to move. These changes would have no financial implications for the Council.

Councillor Sheila Friend-Smith was against increasing the offers to 4 areas, as most people would prefer to live in an area with links to their friends and families. The Principal Housing Officer stated that the district had 7 designated areas and limiting the offers to only 2 meant there was not enough accommodation available to offer. The appeals process would help address these concerns.

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

It was resolved:

That the amendments to the Allocations and Lettings Policy, as set out below, be approved:

- To increase the areas of choice for re-housing from 2 to 4 this increasing the number of potential properties available for bid on. This will ensure timely discharge of homeless duties alongside enabling the housing options team to locate and bid on suitable properties whilst still maintaining an element of choice for the applicant;
- To reduce the period of un-assisted bidding from 3 months (current policy) to 1 bidding round from the applicants date band (or 1<sup>st</sup> available bid if no suitable properties are available to bid on in the 1<sup>st</sup> bidding cycle). After the initial bid(s) if unsuccessful then the housing options team will bid on all available properties (in line with previous amendment) alongside the applicant ensuring no potentially viable properties are missed;
- Currently homeless applicants are not penalised if they refuse an offer of social housing within 3 months of their date in band. It is proposed this time period is removed and that applicants should accept their first offer of accommodation. If they feel that the offer is not suitable then they should move into the property and request a review of the suitability whilst residing in the property. If the applicant refuses the accommodation then homeless duty will be discharged and any provision of temporary accommodation will cease.

## 72. **BED AND BREAKFAST RECHARGING POLICY**

The Committee considered a report, reference N185 previously circulated, which detailed a revised Bed and Breakfast Recharging Policy.

The Principal Housing Officer advised the Committee that, to bring the Council in line with the majority of other local authorities, it was proposed to bring in a recharging policy for users of bed-and-breakfast. The repayment plans would be tailored to suit the particular clients. The repayments would help generate some more revenue for the Council and would be fairer for all clients.

It was resolved:

That the existing Recharging Policy amount for bed and breakfast be amended to 100% which would increase the Council's income and make it a fairer Policy for all clients.

## 72. **REMOVAL AND STORAGE RECHARGING POLICY**

The Committee considered a report, reference N186 previously circulated, which detailed

The Principal Housing Officer advised the Committee that this was a similar idea to the previous agenda item, due to the same principles, but related to removal and storage.

It was resolved:

That the existing Recharging Policy amount for removal and storage be amended to 100% which would increase the Council's income and make it a fairer Policy for all clients.

73. **UPDATE ON THE HOUSING OPTIONS TEAM**

The Committee considered a report, reference N187 previously circulated, which advised on the homelessness prevention initiatives that had been adopted and the results of the changes made.

The Principal Housing Officer advised the Committee that the report gave an update on the work done by the housing options team to prevent homelessness. This was only the start of the work needed and the team were looking to take this work forward, with particular emphasis on young people.

*Councillor Bill Hunt joined the meeting at this point, at 2:56 pm.*

Permission was requested to report on the possible leasing of two properties from Sanctuary, which would be used to semi-support young people. The rent deposit scheme cost £25K but nothing was collected back. Permission was requested to look at the cost effectiveness of appointing a new officer to recover this money.

In the last three months 116 households had been prevented from becoming homeless and homeless applications had fallen to under 25.

Councillor Neil Morrison was concerned about the first request, as the last time this happened the Council ended up with a bill for renovation work. The Committee was advised that the rent and any repairs for the leased properties would be covered by benefit monies, therefore there would be no cost to the Council.

Councillor Sheila Friend-Smith was delighted that help would be given to young people but asked about the hostel. It was revealed that the Young Peoples Project currently had 13 bed spaces available and young people could stay there for 2 years. This was clogging up available spaces, so the leased properties would be used to put young people through to give them some future.

*Councillor Tom Kerby left the meeting at this point, 3:03pm.*

Councillor Mike Rouse was happy to propose the recommendations and reminded the Committee that a year ago the picture was full of doom and gloom with the Council leaking money on this issue. Congratulations were proffered to the Principal Housing Officer and her team on what they had achieved. This just showed what could be



done and what should be done. These sentiments were echoed by the Chairman who thought he team had done an excellent job.

It was resolved:

- (i) That the Principal Housing Officer be allowed to submit a further report on the benefits of leasing 2 properties from Sanctuary Housing for move on young persons supported accommodations;
- (ii) That the Principal Housing Officer be allowed to produce a report for future consideration on how the service recovers money loaned (e.g. deposit, rent in advance, agency fees) and cost effectiveness of employing an income recovery officer to collect these debts.

74. **DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT ON RENEWABLE ENERGY DEVELOPMENT (COMMERCIAL SCALE)**

The Committee considered a report, reference N188 previously circulated, which set out the draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on Renewable Energy Development (commercial scale) and the Council's proposed approach to large scale renewable energy proposals.

The Forward Planning Officer reminded the Committee that it had decided that a SPD on renewable energy should be prepared. The Council was seeing an increase in renewable energy scheme applications on a commercial scale.

*Councillor Tom Kerby re-joined the meeting at this point, 3:06pm*

The SPD outlined the potential impact of these schemes and covered a wide range of issues, such as the natural and built environment. It sorted out what would be acceptable, would inform applicants what they would need to provide and emphasised the need for consultation with residents. Members views on the draft SPD were sought before it was published for consultation.

Councillor Tom Hunt noted the economic benefits in terms of renewable energy but questioned its reliability, as they had not proved they were reliable. Tourism potential had been included but he could not see how these schemes would spark additional tourism. The document itself would be good enough to enable planning decisions to be taken but it stopped short of identifying the Council's stance on the issue. Fracking was an associated issue the Council should look at it.

Councillor Peter Moakes noted that the Committee's brief did not include defining the Council's view on renewable energy as the Government rules had to be applied to applications which went to the Planning Committee. If the SPD went out to consultation and was adopted it would better able the Council to consider relevant applications and make informed decisions.

Councillor Mike Rouse was doubtful about the effect of wind farms on a commercial scale but applications for these would be dealt with through the planning process. A request should be made for a future agenda item to look at the fracking issue.

The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development advised that national policy was still positive towards renewable energy schemes so the Council could not have a policy against them, as this would be struck out of its Local Plan. The Council would judge each application on its merits. The Government also required consultation to be undertaken beforehand so the SPD was trying to set out these parameters. The point made about tourism benefits would be taken out of the document.

Councillor David Brown asked that the document be checked before being sent out for consultation. There were some concerns about the views from Devil's Dyke over the renewable energy site in Burwell.

Councillor Sheila Friend-Smith wondered whether a height restriction could be put on wind turbines, as there was probably a point at which the height would affect the area too much. The Council could also consider a policy for fracking.

Councillor Robert Stevens thought that, in the national context, renewable energy was meant to generate electricity and heat so planning applications would be in the national interest. The Government was trying to cut carbon emissions including cutting gas usage and generating renewable energy, although this was not entirely reliable. The turbine issue was a thorny problem, as was the noise emanating from them and the impact on views, but it would be difficult to set limits. The draft SPD was right in concentrating on general issues and was very comprehensive.

The Chairman thought that officers could be asked to bring forward a paper on the fracking issue.

Councillor Derrick Beckett thought that solar panels could also be intrusive, but the current ones in the district were tucked away. Reassurance was needed that the land could be converted back to agricultural use afterwards. This district had problems with anaerobic digesters, as vehicles transporting material to those sites, some travelling 50 miles or so, were leaving a lot of mud on the roads. This was not mentioned in the document appendix.

Councillor Bill Hunt stated that getting guidance now was a good idea. Some wording should be included in the document to state that some applications 'would not normally be considered', such as for wind turbines over a certain height. Once an application was accepted this would lead to more applications. The Council needed to ensure that little communities in the district were protected.

The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development cautioned the Committee, as it had to be very careful with this issue. Planning Inspectors would be against any arbitrary limits. Any technical work needed on turbine heights which would take time and delay the SPD.

It was resolved:

- (i) That the draft Supplementary Planning Document on Renewable Energy Development (commercial scale) (as attached as Appendix 1) be approved for consultation purposes with the public and key stakeholders;
- (ii) That any subsequent changes to the above document prior to publication be approved by the Head of Planning and Sustainable Development, in consultation with the Chair of this Committee.

## 75. **POSITIVE PLANNING FOR SMALL HOUSING SITES**

The Committee considered a report, reference N189, previously circulated, which outlined how the Council should work in partnership with local communities to plan positively for future growth and affordable housing in villages.

The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development advised the Committee that, in reflecting on the district's experience, the promotion of exception sites had been successful in adding to the affordable housing stock. Work had been done with the Village Visions project, which had been positive. It was suggested that officers take forward by working with the communities to identify growth and affordable housing to supplement the work on Community Land Trusts in the Local Plan and the exception site policy. Work could also be undertaken on providing guidance on exception design.

Councillor Tom Kerby thought this work had already been done and would just replicate it. The communities had already been asked for their views twice, so this would go over old ground. The ideas relating to the first two recommendations should come from the parishes themselves, rather than being suggested by this Council, so this should be deferred for 12 months before being reconsidered.

Councillor Mike Rouse stated that these recommendations should be about encouraging villages with lots of sites identified for development to bring them forward. They had been set development boundaries but these suggestions were now trying to get development beyond them. The parishes themselves should come forward with suggestions.

Councillor Derrick Beckett understood the previous comments but some people in the villages had not realised what had gone on. This information about exception site should be made know to them and these sites should only be used for local people.

Councillor Roberts Stevens asked why shared-ownership properties had not been successful in attracting local people. The Government ought to be encouraging people to buy their own homes. There was a problem with affordable housing on exception sites as the Council worked on the basis that they were windfall sites when they came forward. The Council did not want to identify these potential sites as it would result in an increase in the land price. Although it was also difficult to communicate the benefits of these sites to the parish councils it would be better if these initiatives came from the 'bottom up'.

The Development & Enabling Officer explained that local people looking for shared-ownership properties had suffered issues with mortgages, restrictions in leases as

building societies were reluctant to lend to such properties. Exception sites were entirely led by the landowners. However, a housing need had to be established first.

Councillor David Brown supported Councillor Kerby's view and parishes would not like it if the District Council suggested which sites should come forward. So the first two recommendations should be put on hold for 12 months. There was no need to go out again to the communities but there was a need for some publicity to generate ideas to bring sites forward.

Councillor Neil Morrison thought it would be beneficial if Members knew where exception sites were. Councillor Peter Moakes considered that local people would know where they were, as they would know what land could be delivered for development. It was also agreed that publicity for this was needed.

It was resolved:

That officers commence a review of the East Cambridgeshire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document in order to incorporate additional guidance on what may constitute exceptional design in the East Cambridgeshire context, to justify dwellings outside of the development envelope, with a draft document reported back to a future meeting of the Committee.

*The meeting adjourned and Councillor Sheila Friend-Smith left the meeting at this point, 4:03pm,*

*The meeting reconvened at 4:10pm.*

#### 76. **NORTH ELY DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT**

The Committee considered a report, reference N190, previously circulated, which detailed the responses to the public consultation on the draft North Ely Supplementary Planning Document and sought approval for amendments to the document.

The Principal Sustainable Development Officer reported back to the Committee on the results of the consultation held last autumn. Transport issues were frequently highlighted, which were being taken up with the County Council. The Council was still waiting for the developers to provide a transport strategy, which was nearing completion. This would look at the capacity of the A10, improvements to Lynn Road and cycleway enhancements. There was also a proposal for a new roundabout on the A10, the proposed location of which the County Council were happy with.

The consultation had proved useful as it indicated what the local residents wanted to see. The Church Commissioners had highlighted their concerns over the requirement for 'exemplar' house design and infrastructure requirements, which local people regarded as a priority.

Councillor David Brown thought the development should be aspirational. Therefore the proposed amendments to the document were supported.

*Councillor Sheila Friend-Smith rejoined the meeting at this point, 4:15pm.*

Councillor Mike Rouse agreed that it should be an exemplar development, with the house being varied and different. There were a number of key issues on this development. This related to the open space, which included a country park, as all the green space within the development was important. There was scope to consider how the 'formal' spaces were managed. Connections to the rest of Ely was important and Prickwillow Road had not been highlighted enough, so this had to be sorted out. The management of the road hierarchy had to address the issues of Kings Avenue and how to deal with car parking, as parking should be within the curtilage of the buildings.

Councillor Tom Hunt was concerned that 84-85% of responders were over 40, as the Council needed to know the views of young families and young people. Something should be done to engage these groups by using social media. The Principal Sustainable Development Officer informed the Committee that there was an idea to set up a community forum and social media could also be used.

Councillor Bill Hunt said that, with regard to green spaces for sports provision or the country park, should be on site or within the development, and these points should be included in the SPD otherwise the developers were likely to sidestep the issue. Local residents should have local facilities so including this would give an opportunity for this to be provided.

The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development stated that negotiations were ongoing to secure contributions that would go towards the sports provision on the Downham Road site across the A10. Work was being done on sports need for the development with a view to obtaining additional provision. There would still be a need for open space with perhaps a cricket pitch and tennis courts, but some needs would be met off-site.

The Special Projects Officer reminded the Committee that informal open space would be needed all year round, whereas formal spaces would need more facilities.

Councillor Peter Moakes expected plenty of play areas to be provided throughout the site. The Council should stick to its idea that the development should provide at least one car parking space on each plot. This could mean a radical design for the development.

It was resolved:

- (i) That the proposed amendments to the Draft North Ely Supplementary Document as set out in Appendix 2 be approved;
- (ii) That the Draft North Ely Supplementary Planning Document be approved for use as a material consideration in the assessment of appropriate planning applications.

#### 77. **EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE POP UP GRANT SCHEME**

The Committee considered a report, reference N191, previously circulated, which detailed a grant scheme providing financial support for 'pop up' shops in the District.

The Principal Sustainable Development Officer advised the Committee that a grant scheme had been devised to help 'pop up' shops.

*Councillor Derrick Beckett left the meeting at this point, 4:34pm.*

This would help use under used or unused space in the city centre. The Town Centres Working Party were looking at ways to encourage this, so officers have developed this into a grant scheme, as show in Appendix 1. It was suggested that the maximum grant offered by £500.

Councillor Tom Hunt considered this an exciting scheme and it was good to focus on commercial business, as it was needed. He questioned how long the tenancies were and what happened afterwards in the long term. The Principal Sustainable Development Officer replied that the 'pop ups' were only for a short time.

Councillor Peter Moakes thought this scheme would work with shop owners, who would gain the rent, and would help new business being giving them an opportunity to see if their ideas could work.

Councillor Tom Kerby informed the Committee that 1 company had been offered a grant and had trialled their business for 3 weeks, which had proved very successful, and it might take a further option to repeat the trial. The Scheme would be open to anybody to give additional support for a pop up shop.

It was resolved:

- (i) That a grant scheme, based on the criteria set out in Appendix 1 to the report, be approved for a pilot period of 12 months;
- (ii) That the action taken by the Chief Executive on the grounds of urgency, as set out in section 6 of the report, be endorsed.

78. **BELL ROAD, BOTTISHAM – MASTERPLAN WORK**

The Committee considered a report, reference N193, previously circulated, which looked at a revised site boundary for Bell Road, Bottisham, following consultation on a draft Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document.

The Principal Forward Planning Officer advised the Committee that officers would again work with landowners but in the interim an agreement on an amended site boundary was needed. The draft Masterplan had been used to identify the revised boundary, as shown on the map in Appendix 1. The Parish Council had considered this issue and had broadly endorsed the revision.

A report had been received a couple of hours before this meeting from Bidwells on behalf of the developers. This agreed with some of the revised boundary but suggested straight line southern boundary edge. This would deviate from the draft Masterplan, which they helped draw up. So the officer's proposal within the report was recommended for endorsement.

Councillor Peter Moakes reiterated that the landowners and others had been consulted about the site and agreements had been reached.

Councillor Robert Stevens noted that the boundary had changed during the Masterplan process but the problem was to establish the boundary in the green belt. Councillor Stevens continued by expressing concern that there were not enough allotments within the site. It had also been stated previously that a play area would be located somewhere else but it should be in the site. This was making the site more difficult to deal with. Elsewhere other facilities were found within green belt land. The Council would not want the developer to say there was no room for open space in the site without stating where it would be located. The boundary should be used to show where the allotments and open space would be located.

The Principal Forward Planning Officer stated that the Council had to show to the Planning Inspector the development envelope and the green belt boundary. That would affect what happened next. Barretts had control of the field south of the site and this issue would be brought back for consideration.

Councillor Tom Kerby was content with the proposal, as the Parish Council was happy with it and proposed endorsement of the recommendation. This was duly proposed and agreed.

It was resolved:

That the revised Bell Road site boundary, as shown in the map attached as Appendix 1, be endorsed.

*Councillor Tony Parramint left the meeting at this point, 4:55pm.*

## 79. **FEES AND CHARGES**

The Committee considered a report, reference N194, previously circulated, which reviewed fees and charges of this Committee's services for 2014/15.

The Accountancy Assistant advised the Committee that the review of fees and charges had followed from the Finance and Governance Committee meeting in January. The Appendix showed the recommended changes for 2014/15 as amended by that Committee. This Committee had to agree to those changes as they came within its remit.

Councillor Neil Morrison had asked at the last meeting about the costs of car parking in Littleport. As the fees for the Angel Drove Car Park in Ely were recommended not to increase, it was proposed that the fees for Littleport Station car park also not increase. This amendment was duly seconded and agreed.

Councillor David Brown asked about the increase in traveller sites rent increases. The Accountancy Assistant explained that these had been looked at by the Head of Environmental Services to ensure that they were kept within the boundaries of what the occupiers received from housing benefit.

The Committee agreed to the recommendations excepting the increase in fees at Littleport Station.

It was resolved:

That this Committee's proposed fees and charges for 2014/15, except the proposed increase in car parking at Littleport Station, be approved prior to them being presented to the Finance and Governance Committee in January 2014 and then incorporated into the 2014/15 budget which would require approval by full Council on 27 February 2014.

80. **BUILDINGS OF LOCAL INTEREST**

The Committee considered a report, reference N1950, previously circulated, which advised on the process for setting up an independent panel of experts to assess nominations for inclusion on the Buildings of Local Interest Register.

The Conservation Officer advised the Committee that the intention was to set up a panel to assess nominations for inclusion on the Buildings of Local Interest list. The public would be consulted on those nominations for their support. Research had been undertaken on how other authorities dealt with this issue and it was discovered that there were a variety of ways this could be done. English Heritage had issued some guidance which had helped develop a suggested approach. The Panel would produce a short list, which would be presented to this Committee for decision. The intention would not be to have a 'live' list but that it was reviewed every 3 years, when changes to the list could be made. Any recommendations for inclusion on the list had to meet set criteria. It was therefore recommended that Option 1, for a Panel made up of experts excluding Council Members, be approved.

Councillor David Brown suggested this Option gave out a very negative message, as the Panel was not chaired by an elected Member. It would be better if that Member was not a Member of this Committee. Any time given by a Member would be given freely as no expenses would be paid.

Councillor Robert Stevens thought that having an independent Panel had merit. However, democratic input would be needed. Any Member Chairman should not have a vote.

Councillor Tom Hunt supported that view. The three Options presented in the report were imperfect as there would be no democratic input into the production of the list. So Option 1 should be agreed with the amendment to include a Member as Chairman. It was duly proposed that Option 1 be approved with the proviso that a Member be the Panel Chairman and that Councillor Tom Kerby be that Chairman. When put to the vote this proposal was declared carried.

It was resolved:



- (i) That a panel of experts, consisting of representatives from across the District, chaired by a District Council Member, be approved. A panel of this type would be likely to include local history, architecture and heritage representatives from amenity societies across the District, working collaboratively with the Conservation Officer. The nominations for inclusion on the draft list would be brought back to the Committee for approval for public consultation.
- (ii) That Councillor Tom Kerby be appointed as the Chairman of that panel.

81. **APPRENTICESHIP GRANT SCHEME REVIEW**

The Committee considered a report, reference N196, previously circulated, which reviewed the pilot East Cambridgeshire Apprenticeship Scheme.

The Economic Development Officer advised the Committee on the review of the apprenticeship scheme.

*Councillor Bill Hunt left the meeting at this point, 5:15pm.*

5 apprentices were in place, although initially 10 positions had been available. 5 companies were still looking to take up apprenticeships. £9K had been allocated for this scheme, so £7K was still left. It had been learned that there were many draws on school capacities so more support was needed with the schools, although they had piloted a Youth Enterprise Forum. Companies would be brought to the schools to promote themselves and this work had started. Students' awareness and understanding also had to be increased. Talks had taken place with the Job Centre to help improve take up of the scheme. A Business Breakfast event was being considered to raise the skills agenda and this would involve the schools.

Councillor Peter Moakes was delighted with the work already done but was disappointed with the reaction of the schools. So the Council had to respond to that and change its approach.

*Councillors David Ambrose Smith and David Brown left the meeting at this point, 5:22pm.*

Councillor Tom Kerby had visited the schools but had a pretty poor response so the Council had to be more proactive, as schools did not have the time to deal with this matter. To get results, the Council had to drive this forward.

Councillor Tom Hunt considered the skills agenda very important. The position was now better than last year but this was an area that needed to improve on as a community. Next year a lot of hard work would be needed to help increase take up of apprenticeships.

Councillor Mike Rouse agreed that this should remain a Council priority and this should be given some impetus.

It was resolved:

That the extension of the East Cambridgeshire Apprenticeship Grant Scheme be approved for 2014/15 subject to funding approval and outcome of the wider Council review.

82. **CONNECTING CAMBRIDGESHIRE PROJECT UPDATE**

The Committee considered a report, reference N197, previously circulated, which updated the Committee on the progress of the Connecting Cambridgeshire broadband rollout.

The Economic Development Officer advised the Committee that following the signing of the contract in 2013 the rollout start last November in Cambridgeshire. The next phase was due between March and June, with 34 new cabinets expected in East Cambridgeshire. It was expected that the economic benefit would be 20 times that of the cost of the broadband. Funding had been obtained to support businesses, with efforts being made to secure some for East Cambridgeshire businesses.

Councillor Neil Morrison was concerned that the website declared Littleport to be 'undervalued'. The Committee was advised that Littleport was not within British Telecom's roll out but would benefit from the funding roll out.

Councillor Robert Stevens noted that it was always rural areas that were most difficult to reach and had to play 'catch up'. He would like to see statistics on the improvements in those areas. The Chairman stated these could be brought to Committee.

It was resolved:

That the contents of the report be noted.

83. **BUDGET MONITORING REPORT**

The Committee considered a report, reference N198, previously circulated, which updated the Committee on its financial position for 2013/14 based on current projections for both revenue and capital expenditure.

The Accountancy Assistant advised the Committee of the projected overspends. The capital budget remained as previously reported but the revenue budget had seen an underspend in the last period reducing the overall overspend.

It was resolved:

- (i) That it be noted that this Committee had a projected overspend of £33,047 compared to its approved revenue budget of £2,291,395;
- (ii) That it be noted that this Committee had a projected overspend of £225,826 compared to its approved capital budget of £620,000. This overspend to be funded from reserves.

The meeting closed at 5:35pm.

Draft Minutes