

DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE MINUTES

Minutes of a Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Nutholt Lane, Ely on Tuesday 2nd October 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 Sheila Friend-Smith
Councillor Tony Godge
Councillor Neil Morrison
Councillor Mike Rouse
Councillor Robert Stevens

OTHER ATTENDEES

Shirley Blake - Principal Sustainable Development Officer
Tracey Harding - Team Leader Tourism & Town Centre Services
Darren Hill - Business Development Manager
Giles Hughes – Head of Planning & Sustainable Development
Adrian Scaites-Stokes – Democratic Services Officer
Jane Thompson - Infrastructure Programme Manager
Members of the Public - 1

51. **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

There were no questions from the public.

52. **APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

No apologies were received.

53. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

54. **MINUTES**

It was resolved:

That the minutes of the meeting held 6th September 2012, be confirmed as a correct record and be signed by the Chairman.

55. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman made the following announcements:

Gypsy and Traveller Sites – Local Plan

At the July Committee the potential site options for gypsy and traveller sites were discussed, to allocate in the new Local Plan. A significant number of objections have since been received to one of the option sites, on Isleham Road in Fordham, and public meetings had been held in Isleham and Fordham, attended by about 400 to 500 people in total.

However, the Council has since learnt that the site at Isleham Road was no longer available for development and should shortly secure information of this in writing from the landowner. The site will therefore no longer need to be considered further by the Committee on 6th November, when available site options will be discussed. The Committee meeting will be held at the normal time in Ely.

A letter explaining the current position has been sent to Fordham, Isleham and Chippenham Parish Councils, and everyone who had contacted the Council on this matter, and placed on the Council website.

Ely Crossing

The Cabinet of the County Council considered a range of options, including bypass and underpass options, to solve the problems on the A142 in Ely, on the 17th September. The Cabinet resolved to move forwards with a planning application for option B, which is the Southern Link Road option crossing both the river and railway lines. This was ranked as the best of the options in benefit cost terms, and was most favoured during public consultation. The County will carry out pre-application consultation on the details of the scheme, before submitting an application at the end of the year. The earliest possible start date for construction is summer 2014.

Burwell Masterplan

The draft Burwell Masterplan has now been published for public consultation, after over a year of discussion and debate. A range of consultation activities has been organised including drop in events, public exhibitions and a questionnaire which can either be filled in and returned to venues within the village, or it can be completed online. The consultation closes on 31st October 2012, and everyone is encouraged to give their views on whether the draft plan has 'got it right'.

56. **PRESENTATION: LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP**

The Chairman introduced Natalie Blaken and she gave a presentation introducing Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), to give an idea how it was shaping up and explain about its growth prospectus. The following comments were made:

- The initiative for starting up LEPs had come from the Government.
- This was intended to devolve decisions to a more local level.

- This LEP was built around the Cambridge and Peterborough Sub-Regions and covered 13 local authority areas.
- The LEP was a limited company that was business-led with 14 Board members.
- The LEP itself was a strategic provider, a campaigning body, a programme developer and a fundraiser for key priorities.
- It had a modest start-up fund but was expecting further funding from the Government of £125,000.
- The LEP would provide loans that, when repaid, could be re-invested in other projects.
- More capital funding was expected from Government and if this were well spent there would be more chance of further money.
- It was hoped that some money would be generated by the Enterprise Zone at Alconbury, which could be re-invested.
- East Cambridgeshire would have access to resources, help with projects and initiative with developments, help levering in Government departments and co-ordinating business.
- The LEP had produced its Prospectus, which showed a huge perception of what could be achieved. This was against a background of the tremendous infrastructure and business needs.
- The Prospectus showed a clear set of priorities and how these could be achieved and would be used to inform other investment plans.
- It set out the issues, challenges and options.
- It was out for a 6 week consultation for both a public and private sector response.
- By December a shorter document was wanted, which would identify key priorities and could be used to inform a business plan or to lobby Government.

Councillor Allen Alderson was worried that East Cambridgeshire could miss out due to its small size and bigger problems such as the M11 and A14 would have to be sorted out. Natalie Blaken stated that each local authority was a partner and all had their priorities. These priorities had to be understood but all would have equal opportunities for funding. East Cambridgeshire was centrally placed and so was critically important. The Board had two members who were strong advocates for unlocking the A14 but the Board had to decide how best to intervene.

Following Councillor Sheila Friend-Smith's query, it was revealed that Rutland had been included because of its close links to Peterborough, though the rest of the Partnership was based around Cambridge and Peterborough. Local authorities chose which LEP they wished to join and Rutland had chosen this one.

Councillor Neil Morrison asked whether the LEP could help fund the proposed Ely by-pass. He noted that the congestion of the A142 had not been included in the Prospectus. The Committee was informed that there could have been a long list of roads, suffering from congestion, in the document.

Councillor Tony Goodge thought the road network should be looked at with its connections to the rail network, as happened at Ely. Growth came from such

places, as anything to help increase transport to new business was important. The area had the A14 and A47 as major links but another one was needed to Peterborough. The LEP should use its influence to help this. Natalie Blaken accepted that Ely had tremendous potential because of its rail links. This was also important given the new rail station at Chesterton. The LEP were advocates with both the Government and Network Rail. It was looking at improving rail links between Cambridge and Peterborough but had to consider how this could be funded.

Councillor David Ambrose Smith considered Littleport to have good road and rail links and hoped the town would not be forgotten.

Councillor Sheila Friend-Smith questioned air transport, as it appeared the Stansted airport extension was not now ruled out. Would the LEP have any influence on that? It was revealed that this had not been discussed by the LEP but it would consider it with a view to sustainable economic growth.

Councillor Robert Stevens pointed out that Ely had a road/rail distribution centre that could be better used. This could help take lorries off the roads. Natalie Blaken advised that freight was changing as were ports. Now components were being received and being assembled at ports for onward transport. This added value to ports but meant it was economical to use lorries.

Councillor Colin Fordham thought the number one priority was the Ely by-pass. This should help solve the access problems to Ely endured by the emergency services.

57. **CAR PARKING REGULATIONS**

The Committee considered a report, reference M121, previously circulated, which sought approval of changes to the current East Cambridgeshire Off Street Parking Places Order for public consultation.

The Team Leader Tourism and Town Centre Services advised the Committee that the Order sought to make two changes. The first related to Barton Road car park. The spaces used previously by Sanctuary Hereward were no longer required by them, as they had moved out of the city. The new owners did not require all those spaces, thereby freeing up 21 spaces that could be used by the public. The second change related to Fisherman's Car Park. Currently motor homes could only park in Barton Road for a limited time. This had provoked a lot of complaints. It was therefore proposed to use Fisherman's Car Park to allow long-stay parking for motor homes. Should the draft Order be approved it would go out for consultation, with the results reported back to this Committee in November.

Councillor Allen Alderson, although thinking using Fisherman's Car Park was a good idea, thought Barton Road might be better due to the size of the motor homes. The Team Leader Tourism and Town Centre Services informed the Committee that motor homes already used the road to that car park, so it appeared logical to allow them to use the nearby car park. There would be

problems with Barton Road as the coach bays could not be used and because of the size of the motor homes.

Councillor Tony Goodge was not happy with the choice of Fisherman's Car Park as, although smaller motor homes would be okay, the turning area for larger vehicles was not good. There was scope in Barton Road Car Park to share the bus bays already provided. So Barton Road should be considered.

Councillor Sheila Friend-Smith thought using Fisherman's Car Park was a good idea but was concerned that people would not know how to access it. Better signage was needed. The Team Leader Tourism and Town Centre Services assured the Committee that motor home owners pre-checked locations they were due to visit, so would find out where they could park.

Councillor Mike Rouse was unconvinced about the suitability of the access to Fisherman's Car Park. However, as the proposals were going out for consultation the Committee could consider the comments before making a decision.

It was resolved:

- (i) That the proposal for additional public car parking spaces in Barton Road Car Park be approved;
- (ii) That the proposal to accommodate motor homes in Fisherman's Car Park to provide a long stay parking option in Ely be approved;
- (iii) That the draft East Cambridgeshire Off Street Parking Places Order 2012 be agreed for statutory consultation.

58. **COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY GOVERNANCE AND DELIVERY**

As this was the last Committee that the Infrastructure Programme Manager would be attending before leaving the authority, the Chairman thanked her for her work and wished her well for the future.

The Committee considered a report, reference M122, previously circulated, which sought approval for the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) governance and delivery structure and process.

The Infrastructure Programme Manager advised the Committee that the Council was preparing for the introduction of CIL and had to consider the governance and delivery arrangements. Appendix 1 to the report set out the proposed decision-making structure and the wider process. This would include new officers' and Members' groups to help prioritise where the money should go. It was pointed out that in paragraph 5.7 of the report it should read "The above figures do include the additional income..." Table 2 in the report showed the suggested split between strategic, major or minor projects. The figures had included assumed costs, for example administration, so it showed the residual figures.

Councillor Neil Morrison questioned whether an off-the-shelf information technology programme had been identified to administer the process. The Infrastructure Programme Manager informed Members that specifications had been sent out to suppliers for the software and it was hoped to have a decision on which to use by the end of December. The cost of this had been accounted for as part of the CIL budget.

Councillor Robert Stevens expected some strategic projects to require large investments up front, so would this mean that money would have to be borrowed? The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development stated that this could lead to possible forward funding which would be paid back from CIL. Decisions on smaller scale projects would be considered annually when arranging the Council budget.

It was resolved:

- (i) That the proposed governance and delivery structure (Appendix I) be approved;
- (ii) That the delivery process outlined in Section 6 of the report and in particular the split of projects into Strategic, Major and Minor categories, the percentage of income to be allocated to each as outlined in Table 2 and the principle of the Council producing an Annual CIL Delivery Plan be approved.

59. **ELY TRAFFIC AND ENVIRONMENT STUDY**

The Committee considered a report, reference M123, previously circulated, on the traffic and environment project list and a way forward.

The Infrastructure Programme Manager reminded the Committee that it had considered the results of the consultation at its July meeting. The Council had moved forward with the long list of projects but had looked to narrow down to a short list, which was set out in Table 1, under paragraph 4.3, to the report. These came from a set of projects that could deliver 'quick wins', and were based on the key objectives. Each of the projects had been 'scored' to help draw up the short list and it was suggested that implementation of any of the projects should be delegated to the Head of Planning and Sustainable Development, in consultation with the Committee's Chairman.

The current Market Town Strategy would come to an end next year, so the Council would welcome a review, which would be able to include the schemes so far identified.

Councillor Mike Rouse wanted it noted that all references to the 'Market Square' should read 'Market Place', as that was the actual name of that location. The key to the traffic and environment study was Lisle Lane and so many things were interconnected. A reduction of on-street parking in Lisle Lane would enable better access for buses and would be safer for cyclists. Consideration had to be given for pedestrian and cyclist movements through the city and the use of the increasingly popular bus service. If the bus service was going well then more stops should be installed. Links between Lisle Lane,

Fore Hill and the Market Place needed improvement and this should be helped by the opening of the new Aldi store. With reference to Section 106 agreements, at what stage are the City Council involved to put forward what it wanted?

The Principal Sustainable Development Officer informed the Committee that the new bus service had been amended to incorporate stops at the railway station and the north of Ely. The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development highlighted the ways parish councils could be involved, such as through the work on village visions. They also had opportunities when consulted on planning applications, could contact planning case officers during the application process and through Section 106 meetings with the Chief Executive to talk through upcoming schemes. It was considered very valuable to receive that input and the earlier in the process the better.

Councillor Robert Stevens pointed out that many parish councils normally did not comment unless they were against an application. Parish councils had to think about the implications if applications were passed and developments made.

Councillor Tony Goodge was concerned about difficulties with the parking in Market Street, making it difficult for buses to get through. The taxi trade were also unhappy about their parking provision. This Committee should work with the County Council to address the traffic hold-ups in this location. Although there had been a slight improvement in the use of the Sainsbury bus this needed looking at to achieve better use. Overall more vision was needed around Ely on all its parking to achieve improvements. The Infrastructure Programme Manager stated that the County Council were aware of the problems and that it had come up as a high priority.

Councillor Neil Morrison noted that the shortlist had been scored but no priority given to the projects. The parking in Lisle Lane should be given higher priority. The Infrastructure Programme Manager hoped to deliver the projects when opportunities presented themselves. The County Council were aware of the bus stops being blocked and the dangerous parking.

Councillor Mike Rouse moved the proposals and expected officers to note the comments made by the Committee. This was agreed by the Committee.

It was resolved:

- (i) That the list of projects identified through the consultation work (Appendix I) be narrowed down to the short list identified in Table 1/para 4.3 for further costings and investigation work;
- (ii) That the shortlist is then circulated to stakeholders such as the City of Ely Council for further comments;
- (iii) That decision on taking forward the projects identified in Table 1/para 4.3 be delegated to the Head of Planning and Sustainable Development, in consultation with the Chairman of the Committee. This would happen only where appropriate and where good value opportunities exist;
- (iv) That the Head of Planning and Sustainable Development reports back regularly to the Committee;

- (v) That officers advise Cambridgeshire County Council that this Committee would welcome a review of the current Ely Market Town Transport Strategy in view of the range of issues raised in the consultation.

60. **CAMBRIDGE AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

The Committee considered a report, reference M124, previously circulated, on Council representation on the Cambridge Airport Consultative Committee.

Councillor Peter Moakes proposed Councillor Kevin Ellis as the Council representative, and this was seconded by Councillor David Ambrose Smith.

Councillor Sheila Friend-Smith proposed Councillor Robert Stevens as the Council representative, and this was seconded by Councillor Neil Morrison.

As the Committee considered both nominees as equally acceptable it agreed to decide the matter by a toss of a coin and Councillor Kevin Ellis was thereby appointed.

It was resolved:

That Councillor Kevin Ellis be appointed as the Council representative on the Cambridge Airport Consultative Committee.

61. **CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP**

The Committee considered a report, reference M125 previously circulated, on the Council's involvement in the Greater Cambridgeshire and Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnerships (GCGPLEP).

The Business Development Manager tabled the revised LEP Prospectus and stated that the LEP were trying to create a generic prospectus.

Last year a financial contribution to the LEP of £16000 had been made by the Council and it had asked about a return for that investment. The LEP had supported the Ely by-pass project. This year's subscription had been set as a minimum of £7,500, though the 2013-2014 subscription was expected to be up to £17,500. It was proposed to subscribe at the same level as last year. This would encourage the LEP to support the Council and offer its expertise. The LEP was also asking the Council to become a corporate member. This would not incur any additional financial burden on the Council. The Council had to be in the Partnership to have any benefit from it. The subscriptions were due in November.

Councillor Peter Moakes wanted the LEP to help push for another place for a new E-Space facility, this time in Soham, as the Council did not have the money for it. The LEP would have access to money and expertise.

The Business Development Manager had showed an LEP representative to E-Space North and showed her how it linked into business development in the

district. Initially proposals for Soham Station and the E-Space development had been put to the LEP. Unfortunately the proposals were not sufficiently advanced to meet the LEP's criteria.

Councillor David Ambrose Smith thought that the Council should have a Member on the LEP Board. The Business Development Manager explained that the Government had set LEPs up and wanted them to be led by the private sector. The Committee was reminded that there were 3 Members on the Board from other local authorities.

Councillor Mike Rouse thought the proposed response to the Prospectus was good. A lot of development had gone on in business parks but there were opportunities to develop elsewhere. Other partners should be considered, such as from big business, to help the Council 'grow' its own jobs wherever a site might appear in the district.

Councillor Sheila Friend-Smith asked how the Council's contribution compared to other local authorities. The Business Development Manager revealed that one local authority proffered the minimum allowed, though most had contributed more than was required last year. That might change this year.

Councillor Mike Rouse left the meeting at this point, 4:02pm.

The Committee considered its contribution for this year and after some debate it was proposed by Councillor David Ambrose Smith, seconded by Councillor Allen Alderson, that it make a contribution of £10,000. This was agreed.

It was resolved:

- (i) That East Cambridgeshire District Council contribute £10,000 to the GCPCLEP in 2012/13;
- (ii) That East Cambridgeshire District Council's response to the GCGPLEP Prospectus be approved;
- (iii) That East Cambridgeshire District Council's Legal Services be instructed to complete the incorporation documents so that East Cambridgeshire District Council becomes a corporate member of the GCGPLEP.

62. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC INCLUDING REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PRESS**

It was resolved:

That the press and public be excluded during the consideration of the remaining item no(s). 13 because it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present during the item(s) there would be disclosure to them of exempt information of Category 3 of Part I Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

63. **EXEMPT MINUTES**

It was resolved:

That the exempt minutes of the meeting held 6th September 2012, be confirmed as a correct record and be signed by the Chairman.

The meeting concluded at 4:17pm.